



BX

5149

.C5

V63

1871



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

THE EUCHARIST.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

THE
TRUE DOCTRINE
OF
THE EUCHARIST.

BY

THOMAS S. L. VOGAN, D.D.

CANON AND PREBENDARY OF CHICHESTER : VICAR OF WALBERTON-WITH-YAPTON :
RURAL DEAN : AND PROCTOR IN CONVOCATION FOR THE
ARCHDEACONRY OF CHICHESTER.

LONDON :
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1871.

P R E F A C E.



THIS IS, in reality, the second edition of a former work published in 1849 : * but as it has grown to a much larger size, and embraces much more than I then treated of ; as I have pursued a different method in some important respects, though coming, substantially, to the same conclusion ; and as I have adopted a different title, the present edition is not announced in form as a second.

The basis of the work is the literal interpretation of the records of the institution of the Eucharist. The Romanist, the Lutheran, and that section of the Church of England which is so ably led by Dr. Pusey, all demand the literal interpretation. And as I think with Dr. Pusey that the literal interpretation is the basis of the true interpretation, I concede and reiterate the demand.

But here we are instantly separated : for there is a difference in actual fact, though not in conscious deliberate intention, as to the subject of this literal interpretation ; and, in necessary sequence, a very wide difference as to the interpretation itself.

The subject of interpretation professed in the doctrine of the Church of Rome, of Luther, and of Dr. Pusey, is the words, " This is my body, this is my blood " : but, as is shown in the following pages, the actual subject is those four words only,

* Nine Lectures on the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The Ecclesiastic demurred to the propriety of the title (vol. VIII. 302), as leading to " much misconception " with regard to this Sacrament. It certainly does not well accord with the views which were advocated by that periodical : but it might be recollected by members of the Church of England, and particularly by those who take upon them to deliver her doctrines, that " the Lord's Supper," and " the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," are the only names for the Eucharist to be found in the Catechism, and the Articles of Religion : while the Liturgy is entitled " The Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or the Holy Communion."

“This is my body”; the second proposition, “This is my blood,” being treated as a mere expletive, as having neither any distinct meaning from the other, nor any effect whatever on its interpretation.

And not only this; but the facts of the institution, and the other words of our Lord in it, are totally ignored, so far as the doctrine is to be influenced by them.

It would therefore follow, in logical necessity, that an interpretation even of the four words subjected to it, would be neither literal nor true.

This, however, has been the manner of theologians, and the result of their dissertations and disputations, for many centuries. For a thousand years the general doctrine, how varied soever the forms of expression might be, from age to age, was, that the consecrated bread is the body of Christ given for us, and that the wine is his blood shed for us. It was, in fact, in substantial and plain agreement with his own words at the institution: and the manifold varieties of expression in which it was set forth, were, in reality, no more than a reiteration of them. And the words were understood, not in the grossly carnal and Capernaite sense, which was imposed upon Berengarius; but in the spiritual sense to which the literal interpretation necessarily leads. But when Berengarius had been required by the rulers of the Church, to profess that “that mystical bread is substantially converted into the true and proper flesh of Christ,” and that the true body and blood of Christ “are sensibly, not only in a sacrament, but in truth, handled by the hands of the priests, broke and ground by the teeth of the faithful”:* the natural rationalism of men’s minds was excited, and was impelled to attempt an explanation of this doctrine, and to reconcile it with undeniable facts. The natural elements remained, after consecration, unchanged to sense; though changed to faith; but the substance of them, the unseen reality, by which they are that which they are called, was supposed to be affected in some manner, so as to make way for the body and blood of Christ.

* See below, p. 63.

It was supposed by some to be annihilated, and by others to be changed into the substance of that body and blood. And this was conceived to be possible, only by the presence of our Lord Himself, contained under the appearance or species of the elements. Thus He was conceived to be equally present, the same presence was conceived to be contained, in one species as well as the other, in the species of wine as well as of bread : whole Christ under and in each. And hence, in effect, the whole doctrine was regarded as contained in the four words, "This is my body" : while the doctrine was professedly founded upon the literal interpretation of all our Lord's words on the subject, and was conceived to be logically developed from them.

It was never suspected, that this doctrine involved an entire and absolute surrender of the literal interpretation : although it was so obvious, that "This is," cannot literally mean "This contains" ; and that the one assertion implies a contradiction to the other.

Nor did the opponents of this doctrine pursue a much more legitimate method. Luther, in order to avoid the difficulties of transubstantiation, maintained that the elements suffered no change, but that the body and blood of Christ are present with them. And thus, while he contended for the literal interpretation, he, in reality, took "This is" to mean, "This has with it" : and implied again a contradiction to the original words.

Others opposed the literal interpretation, and the doctrines which were imagined and professed to be drawn from it ; and contended that our Lord's words must be understood figuratively ; and, therefore, that "This is," means "This represents" ; involving, again, no less than a contradiction to the words.

And others would have it, that "This is," means something very like "This is not," in explicit contradiction again to the words.

The Tractarians,—of whom I use the name, only because I know not what other name to give them,—have combined the Roman and the Lutheran exegesis ; and, in effect, though not

formally, propose "This has in it the real objective presence of," as the literal interpretation of "This is."

Thus the grand debate, during the last eight hundred years, has, in real substance, been the right interpretation of these four words, "This is my body," and of them only. And they who have contended for the literal interpretation, have entirely overlooked it, and have failed to see, that "This is," in literal interpretation, can mean no more than "This is," neither more nor less: while they who have contended against a literal interpretation, and have asserted that the words are a figure, have alike failed to see, how uncertain their argument is, and how much better foundation, and how much truer a guide, the literal interpretation, is, for doctrine, than the figurative. *

But the whole of the record must be taken for the subject of the literal interpretation which is demanded. This, no one, whatever his views may be, can possibly doubt. And there can be as little doubt, that the literal interpretation of the record must be under these rules: first, that it shall not exclude any part of the letter, nor include anything beyond it, or that is not necessarily in strict construction deduced from it: secondly, that it be in perfect and entire consistency with itself: and thirdly, that it be in like consistency with the analogy of the faith.

Such will be found to be the interpretation given in the following work; neither going beyond the letter, nor coming short of it; nor violating any article of the faith.

For the letter is, that "Jesus took the bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave it": "And He took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it." And the literal interpretation is, that that which He gave, was that which He took: that He blessed the bread which He took, and brake the bread which He blessed, and gave

* The reader will find a very able and most interesting synopsis of Eucharistic history in my friend Archdeacon Freeman's *Principles of Divine Service*, *Introd. to Part II*. The argument, however, I am bound to say, is occasionally embarrassed by the notion, on which I have remarked elsewhere, that the body and blood of Christ must be "there," in order that we may receive them: which is to limit spiritual things by the conditions and necessities of material things.

the bread which He broke: that He gave thanks over the cup which He took, and gave the cup over which He gave thanks: that He took bread and wine, and gave bread and wine.

Then the records say, that when He gave the bread, He "said, Take, eat; this is my body"; and that when He gave the cup, He said,—“This is my blood.” And the literal interpretation of this is, not “This contains,” “This has with it,” or “This has under its form the presence of, my body”: “This contains,” “This has with it,” or “This has under its form the presence of, my blood”: but “This—is—my body, This—is—my blood.” Nor is the literal interpretation, “This represents or is a figure of my body, my blood.” The letter and the literal interpretation of that letter is, that the bread—is—the body, and that the wine—is—the blood, of Christ.

And He said not these words only, but of that body He said, it was “being given, or broken, for you,” and of that blood He said, it was “being shed for you. This is my body which is being given for you; This is my blood which is being shed for you, for the remission of sins.” And the literal interpretation of this is, that it is his body being given, given for us, given for sin, given to God: and that it is his blood being shed, being poured out, for sin, for the remission of sins. The letter does not speak of the Lord’s body in any other condition than in that of “being given for us”; or of his blood in any other condition than in that of being poured out for sin. The letter sets forth the Lord’s body as a sacrifice for sin: it sets forth his blood as poured out from his body for sin. It sets forth his body and his blood separated from each other; and since blood is the life of the body, the body, from which the blood is poured out, has its life taken away, and is dead. The letter sets forth the body of Christ, and his blood, separate, the one from the other: as given by Him, separate, the one from the other. As the bread and the wine were distinct things, and were given separately from each other: so He gave his body and his blood, separately from each other: and therefore it was his dead body which He gave.

The letter of the records, and the literal interpretation of them, will not suffer us to go beyond this.

The letter, again, is, that He took bread, and said, "This is my body," and that He took wine, and said, "This is my blood." It tells us that He gave one, and afterwards the other. It does not tell us that his body was in, or with, or under, the one; that his blood was in, or with, or under the other. It does not say that He Himself was in, or with, or under them. The very facts demonstrate, that his body was not in, or with, or under the bread; that his blood was not in, or with, or under the wine: that He Himself was not in, or with, or under them, or either of them. And the literal interpretation must so declare it.

The letter is that one element of the Eucharist is bread,—and—is—the body of Christ: that the other element is wine,—and—is—the blood of Christ. Each of the elements has by the letter, this double character. It is as true of one, that it is the body of Christ, as it is true that it is bread: it is as true of the other, that it is the blood of Christ, as it is that it is wine. But the truth is according to the nature of each. By their nature the elements are bread and wine: but according to the nature of the body and blood of Christ, one poured out, and the other dead, one is not in such a way the body of Christ as it is bread, and the other is not in such a way the blood of Christ as it is wine. The bread is the body of Christ, and the wine is the blood of Christ, in a way beyond the nature of earthly things. The bread and the wine are the body and blood of Christ, so far as one thing can be another; the nature of each being unchanged. They are what He called, and by calling made, them, to all the intents and purposes for which He so made them. The wine is his blood poured out, the bread is his body given, the life being taken from it, and the body therefore, dead:—but both in spiritual effect, not in positive and absolute reality.

But here we must remember the analogy of the faith. We believe and know, that now, the body of our Lord Jesus Christ is not dead. We know that once, for three days, it was dead, and the blood was poured out from it: but after the third day, He rose again, and death has had no more dominion over Him.

He ever liveth. His dead body is no more : his poured-out blood is no more. They are not anywhere, they cannot be present anywhere. They were not, when He first gave them. His body was not broken ; it was alive and unhurt, when He gave his dead body : his blood was not shed ; it was all still flowing in his veins, when He gave his poured-out blood. Yet He gave, and it was in most real truth that He gave, his dead body and his outshed blood. And now, He gives the same : his dead body, though his body is alive for evermore ; his outshed blood, though it is impossible, and, since the day that it was shed upon the cross, has been impossible, for it ever to be shed again. Neither the blood remains poured out, nor the body dead. One is no more in the condition of being given, the other is no more in the condition of being shed. They are no more. His dead body is nowhere to be found, his poured-out blood is nowhere to be found. In most certain and absolute fact and reality, they are not. And as that which is not, cannot be present anywhere ; the dead body of our Lord, and his blood shed, cannot be, and therefore are not, present either in the Eucharist, or in its elements.

The letter speaks only of the given body, and the poured-out blood. It says nothing of our Lord's living body, or of his glorified body. It says nothing, and implies nothing, of his soul or his Godhead. It says nothing of any presence ; nothing of any presence of his Godhead or manhood ; nothing of the presence of his soul, of the presence of his Godhead ; nothing of the presence even of his body and his blood. Nor does the letter necessarily or logically imply, any presence of his body and blood. He spoke of no presence : He gave no presence. To speak of a presence in the case, is to add to the letter ; it is to give an explanation, instead of an interpretation : and the notion of it is pure rationalism.

Our Lord gave his body broken, and not his or its presence. He gave his blood shed, and not his or its presence. Nor was it necessary that his body should be present in order that He should give it ; that his blood should be present in order that He should give it. His body was not present, either living or

dead, in the bread which He gave: his blood was not present, either flowing in his veins, or poured out from them, in the wine which He gave. He said of the bread, only, "This is my body which is given for you." He said of the wine, only, "This is my blood which is shed for you, for the remission of sins." And when He gave the bread and the wine, He gave also at the same time that which was not. He delivered his body given and broken, before it was, and when, as yet, it was not, given and broken: He gave his blood poured out, before it was, and when, as yet, it was not, poured out. He gave that which, as yet, at the time when He gave it, was not: and therefore He gave that which was not present, and could not be present.

Again, keeping to the analogy of the faith, we know that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, although it was not given and broken, when He said, "This is my body which is given for you"; was yet most surely to be given and broken: and that his blood, although it was not shed, when He said, "This is my blood which is shed for you"; was yet most surely to be shed. And from this it is necessarily to be concluded, that it was, not by a real presence of his body and blood, but spiritually and effectually, that they were given. It was to the faith that his body—was—to be broken, that He gave it: it was to the faith that His blood—was—to be shed, that He gave it. And now that his body has been given and his blood has been shed: they are no longer in those conditions: they now are not. But to faith, and to the faith only, that his body has been given, and that his blood has been shed, He now imparts his body given, and his blood shed, just as He imparted them to his Apostles, the night before He suffered. And this He did and now does, although the presence of his broken body and his out-poured blood was then, and now is, impossible.

With this literal interpretation of the whole letter, the doctrine of the ancient Fathers of the Church, for many centuries, and the doctrines of the great Divines of the Church of England, perfectly agree. All agree that it—is—the body of our Lord Jesus

Christ which was given for us, which we receive ; and that it—is —his blood which was shed for us, which we receive. They do not teach, that it is the living, glorified body of our Lord, his living, glorified body, present in the bread and wine, which we receive. But they teach us, that by receiving his body given,—and—his blood shed for us, we are made one with Him ; are united to his glorious body, dwell in Him, and have Him also dwelling in us.

Again, the letter has it, that our Lord gave bread,—his body broken, and also gave wine,—his blood shed. And therefore, if we are to obey his word, “Do this,” both the bread and the wine, both the body and the blood, are to be administered.

The letter, likewise, shows that our Lord was not, and is not, present in the bread and wine of the Eucharist ; and therefore it compels the conclusion that He is not to be adored as present in them.

In the letter again, we find not one word from which it can be shown, that when our Lord took bread and wine for his Holy Supper, He made either a sacrifice or an oblation of them, or taught us to do so. On the contrary, instead of sacrificing them, and so devoting them to destruction, He blessed them with thanksgiving : and He spoke of no oblation or sacrifice, but of Himself. The literal interpretation admits of no sacrifice to be offered by us, in fulfilling his words that we should do as He did ; but that which is comprehended in the sacrifice of thanksgiving. This is the true Eucharistic sacrifice.

And lastly, since there is not, nor can be, any real presence of the body and blood of Christ, in, or with, or under the elements or their form : no sacrifice can be offered of Him, or of his body and blood, in, or with, or under them : whether they remain in their proper, natural substances, or do not. The Eucharistic sacrifice, therefore, which is offered by us, is not of Christ, or of his body and blood, or of his presence. The letter has nothing of any such oblation to be made by us. He only could, He only Himself did, offer that all-sufficient sacrifice.

And having made it, He now makes us, not offerers, but partakers of it. And we plead that sacrifice before the throne of God. We rely on it as all-sufficient, and all-prevailing with the Father. We embrace its benefits; and render all the return we can make for it, in the oblation of ourselves, our souls and bodies, as a reasonable, holy, and acceptable sacrifice to God.

But to offer the sacrifice of the Son of God is beyond all created power. The letter of the records has nothing to suggest such blasphemy.

I have not undertaken the task of treating of the devotions suitable, and necessary for, receiving the Holy Communion: for this would have been greatly to enlarge my labour and my book. But there are very many Preparations and Aids by far more competent pens. I profess to be only the exponent of the very letter of the records: and must leave the reader to choose his guide in the devotions for Communion, according to the views which, on careful study of this work, he may deliberately adopt.

I would, however, say, that, so far as my knowledge of devotional works on the subject reaches, Dean Goulburn's late work on the Holy Communion may be safely commended for the use of English Churchmen.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

NAMES OF THIS HOLY RITE.

	PAGE
Breaking of Bread	1
Lord's Supper	3
Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ	4
Oblation	4
Sacrament	5
Eucharist	5
Memorial and Commemoration	5
Sacrifice and Passover	6
Designations of it in our Liturgy	6
Descriptions of it in the Homilies	7
Enumeration of titles given to it, by Jer. Taylor	7

CHAPTER II.

SACRAMENTS. OUTWARD SIGNS NOT ABOLISHED BY THE GOSPEL, BUT ORDAINED BY IT.

Definition of a Sacrament in our Catechism	9
Definition of a Sacrament by the Church of Rome	10
Number of the Sacraments	10
Rejection of Sacraments by the Quakers	10
Refutation of their Arguments	12
The two Sacraments ordained by Christ generally necessary to Salvation	15

CHAPTER III.

THE OUTWARD PART OR SIGN IN THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Bread and Wine the outward part or sign of this Sacrament	17
Nothing to be used but what our Lord took and gave	17
What kind of bread to be used	18
Bread of the fine flour of wheat	19
Either leavened or unleavened bread may be used	21
Practice of the Church	21
Leavened bread used by the Eastern Church	21
Wafers not used in Church of Rome till 11th or 12th centuries	21

	PAGE
Practice of the Church anciently ruled by the oblations of the people	21
Indifferent whether leavened or unleavened	22
Law of the Church of England	22
Recent judgment of the Court of Arches was wrong, and why	23
Size and shape of the bread	24
The Wine: no other liquid to be used instead of it	27
Breaches of the Rule of our Church from private judgment	28
Wine necessary	29
Heresy of rejecting wine	31
Total Abstinence Society	31
Wine used by our Lord; and ordained by Him in this Sacrament	33
Fruit of the vine in its customary condition	34
Mixing water with the wine	35
Not certain that the Jews always used a mixed cup	36
Mixed cup not obligatory	37
Rule of our Church	39
Mixing it unlawful in the Service	39
Opinion of Bishop Andrewes	39
Mixing before the Service no open breach of law, but inconsistent with the intention of the Church	41

CHAPTER IV.

CONSECRATION OF THE SACRAMENT.

Our Lord's example the rule of our Liturgy	43
How St. Paul understood the institution	44
He and the other Apostles delivered it, as they had received it	45
Form of words of consecration: no better or other than our Lord's own: the Lord's Prayer naturally joined with it	45
The necessary and sufficient form	46

CHAPTER V.

THE EFFECTS OF CONSECRATION.

Controversies from rationalistic opinions	48
Progress of rationalism	48
Transubstantiation—the name mediæval	51
The doctrine	51
Doctrine of Luther	53
Dr. Pusey's objection to call it Consubstantiation	54
His own doctrine, that of the nineteenth century, very similar	54
Archdeacon Wilberforce's statements of doctrine	55
Agreement of the Roman, Lutheran, and nineteenth century doctrine	56

CHAPTER VI.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION: CHANGE OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE ELEMENTS.

Transubstantiation	57
Church of Rome forbids belief of the substance remaining	58
Paschasius Radbertus	59
His doctrine	60

	PAGE
His doctrine not transubstantiation	60
Berengarius—his first retractation	63
His second retractation	63
What transubstantiation involves	63
Substances and accidents independent of each other, a thing totally unknown	64
Creation of light before the sun	64
Accidents without their substance contrary to all experience	65
Properties a proof of the thing they belong to	65
Our Lord's attributes a proof of his Divinity	66
Accidents destroyed with their substance	67
No attempt by Aquinas to prove that accidents can be separated from their substance	67
Is the substance converted?	68
We are sure that the elements are bread and wine before consecration	68
And have the same proof after consecration	68
This our senses tell us	69
"The senses may be deceived," but it is rather our judgment which is deceived	69
All the senses of all men, everywhere, and always, cannot be deceived about the same thing	70
Romanists trust their senses as to the accidents	70
Admission and argument of Bellarmine	71
Substance of all material things, material	72
The verdict of our senses to be relied on, for our Lord required such use of them; miracles, appeals to them; the proof of Christ's resurrection depends on them; and faith is founded on their credibility	74
If the Apostles trusted their sight, we may ours	75
Unanswerable argument of Tertullian	77
Yet bread and wine are something more after consecration: they are the body and blood of Christ	78
Extract from Jeremy Taylor	79

CHAPTER VII.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION: WHOLE CHRIST UNDER THE SPECIES.

Substance of the elements supposed to be preserved, but converted: argument of Aquinas	80
But no particle of them forming the body of Christ	81
Transubstantiation without transubstantiation	81
Change into the body and blood of Christ	82
But the elements have not the properties of Christ's body, and therefore do not contain it	83
35 - Plea of the power of God	83
Some things are impossible with God	84
Conditions of the case: they show transubstantiation to be impossible	84
It is not shown to be God's will to work it	85
Transubstantiation, after all, useless	85

CHAPTER VIII.

CONSUBSTANTIATION, AND THE NINETEENTH CENTURY DOCTRINE OF THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE.

The doctrine of Luther	87
The doctrine of Dr. Pusey	88

	PAGE
The doctrine of Archdeacon Wilberforce	89
The Memorial addressed to Archbishop Longley	90
Mr. Carter's correspondence with Mr. Marriot, &c.	90
Romanists, Lutherans, and Tractarians assert the presence of Christ's glorified body	91
The term "Real Presence" dates about the time of the Reformation, and objected to by our Reformers	91

CHAPTER IX.

THE LITERAL INTERPRETATION DEMANDED BY THE TEACHERS OF THE
REAL PRESENCE, BUT MISTAKEN BY THEM.

The demand is just and is conceded: but it is not followed up by those who make it	92
The Institution	93
The actual interpretation of Rome	93
The interpretation of Luther and of Dr. Pusey, &c.	95
All three systems assert the presence of the glorified body	95
Their doctrines respectively translated into the form of our Lord's words	96
And compared with them	97
They take only the words "This is my body," practically omitting all the rest	99
Implicitly denying our Lord's words	100

CHAPTER X.

THE LITERAL INTERPRETATION VINDICATED.

The words to be interpreted	102
The tenses of the Greek participles	103
Our Lord gave the bread and the cup separately	103
And it was the dead body	104
The literal interpretation excludes the glorified body, and it is beyond the question to speak of its powers	104
All the ancient Fathers agree	105
None of them speak of the glorified body as present	105
By "The flesh and blood of Christ," as our food, they mean his body sacrificed	106
Testimonies of the Fathers—Clement of Alexandria, &c.	107
St. Augustine, &c.	108
Divines of the Church of England	109
The notion of the glorified body a late invention	110
The words not, as Archdeacon Wilberforce put it, merely "This is my body, This is my blood"	111
This the mistake of many, but unintentional	112
The circumstances of the Institution considered: our Lord not present in the elements then	113
He spoke the words of the bread and the wine	114
His body not dead, nor his blood shed, when He gave his body broken, and his blood poured out	115
The words no mere figure	115
They were true then, and are true ever since, in all necessary reality	116

CHAPTER XI.

ONE AND THE SAME GIFT IN THE EUCHARIST FROM THE FIRST.

	PAGE
Bishop Moberley's opinion of a fuller offering of the body of Christ now	117
Similar notion of Archdeacon Wilberforce	118
St. Augustine's opinion	120
St. Chrysostom's	121
English Divines	121
Another opinion of Archdeacon Wilberforce	122
The notion of a fuller gift now, unscriptural	123
The Holy Spirit may impart larger benefits from the same gift	123
The true spiritual sense of our Lord's words	124
St. Paul received as our Lord first instituted	124
No fresh revelation	125
The dead body cannot be present	125
The body and blood of Christ not necessary to be present : and to make the body glorified is to make a new Sacrament	125
Dr. Pusey's assertion that the body and blood of Christ must be "there," in order that we may receive them	125
Bishop Forbes of Brechin	126
The notion is rationalistic	127
Faith can realise the past and the absent	127
Bearing of the investigation on doctrine of "The Real Presence"	128
Differences between literal interpretation and that doctrine	128
It contradicts our Lord's words	129

CHAPTER XII.

OUR LORD GAVE HIS BODY BROKEN, AND HIS BLOOD SHED. HE GAVE NOT NOR PROMISED HIS GLORIFIED BODY. NO PRESENCE OF THAT WHICH HE DID GIVE, AND NO PRESENCE OF THAT WHICH HE DID NOT PROMISE, TO BE EXPECTED.

Meaning and force of our Lord's words now	130
Not a "Real and Objective Presence"	131
Our Lord said nothing of his glorified body	131
The dead body now is not, and therefore cannot be present	132
The sum of all	132
No real objective presence of that which our Lord gave and promised	132
Bishop Andrewes says we must go "ad cadaver"	132
Our Lord neither gave nor promised his glorified body	133

CHAPTER XIII.

ST. JOHN VI. AND 1 COR. X.

John vi.	135
Division or place of division of no moment	135
VI. 51, &c. recited	135
Force of our Lord's words	136
He spoke of his Flesh, his body as a sacrifice, and to be eaten when away in heaven : not of his glorified body	137
1 Cor. xi. 27-29	138
True meaning and force of "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" doubtful	139

CHAPTER XIV.

THE TEACHING OF THE ANCIENT FATHERS.

	PAGE
Appeal to the ancient Fathers	140
Question first stated	140
Testimonies taken as collected by Dr. Pusey	141
Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tatian, Clement of Alexandria, 141 : Tertul- lian, Anonymous author, Hippolytus, Origen, 142 : Firmilian, Dionysius Alexandrinus, Cyprian, Lawrence Martyr, Magnes, 143 : Peter of Alexandria, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Council of Nice, James of Nisibis, Athanasius, 144 : Council of Alexandria, Cyril Hieros., 145 : Basil, Gregory Naz., Macarius, Ambrose, 145 : Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Apostolical Constitutions, Cyril of Alexandria 146 : Leo	147
Discrimination necessary in applying such testimonies	147
What these testimonies amount to	148
The doctrine of "The Real Presence" not proved by them	148
Places alleged for the Presence "in" the elements	149
The Fathers did not understand the two propositions in our Lord's words as identical ; but the teachers of "The Real Presence" do	150
St. Cyril Hier., "In the figure of bread"	151
St. Ephrem Syrus	153
St. Epiphanius, St. Augustine	156
St. Chrysostom	157
Distinction between "is," and "is understood"	158
"Local inclusion"	159
"After the manner of a Sacrament"	159
Roman doctrine that Sacraments "contain" grace	160
A finite body cannot be without local inclusion	160
The Fathers do not teach the presence of the glorified body	160

CHAPTER XV.

TEACHING OF THE DIVINES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

History of the term "Real Presence"	162
Different senses of the term	165
Bishop Ridley	167
Bishops Montagu and Bilson	170
Richard Hooker	175
Bishop Overall	176
Bishop Morton	178
Bishop Andrewes	180
Dr. Donne	181
Dean Jackson	182
Dr. Sutton	183
Bishop White	184
Archbishop Laud	185
Bishop Forbes	189
Joseph Mede	190
George Herbert	190
Archbishop Bramhall	191
Bishop Cosin	193
Bishop Sparrow	199
Dr. Hammond	200

	PAGE
Bishop Fell	201
Herbert Thorndike	201
Hamon L'Estrange	204
Bishop Taylor	205
Bishop Ken	207
Bishop Hackett	208
Bishop Beveridge	209
Bishop Bull	211
Dean Hicke	211
Dean Comber	212
Archbishop Wake	213
John Johnson	213
Archbishop Sharp	215
Charles Leslie	216
Dr. Brett	217
Charles Wheatley	218
Bishop Wilson	219
Dr. Grabe	220
Bishop Phillpotts	221
Mr. Palmer	222
The term "Real Presence" not so commonly adopted as is supposed	225
Declined by 27 out of 37 authors cited	228
Use of the term in our Church a mistake	228

CHAPTER XVI.

THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The Catechism	229
Sacramentum, and res, and virtus, Sacramenti	230
St. Augustine made the res and virtus the same	231
Two parts in both Sacraments	232
Inward part or thing signified the same with the inward and spiritual grace	232
"Inward" does not mean "in"	233
"Verily and indeed"	233
Compilers of Prayer Book did not use "body" and "blood" as synonymous	234
The Communion Service	235
Exhortation on giving notice; exhortation in the celebration	235
Prayer of humble access; form in delivering the bread and cup	236
Prayer in the Post Communion	237
The Articles	239
Dr. Pusey assumes "The Real Presence" proved by the rest of the Prayer Book	240
Bishop Geste's statement beside the question	245
The Rubrics	246
The Black Rubric	246
A body must be present after the manner of a body	249
For a body to be present after the manner of a spirit, no gain, except it can be everywhere	250
Rubric after the Service	250
Evidence of formularies summed up	251
The Homilies	252
We are not bound by every word in them	252
"No untrue figure of a thing absent" no proof of "The Presence"	252
Brief sum of all	25

CHAPTER XVII.

THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND CONTINUED. MISUSE OF THE
TERM REAL PRESENCE.

	PAGE
Our Lord really present in his Divine nature	255
The ancient Fathers spoke not of a presence	256
The bread, the body ; and the wine, the blood, of Christ ; and his body and blood are present in this sense	256
The Church of England ignorant of the term and of the doctrine it implies	256
Its use in the Church of England a great mistake	257
True sense of a real presence	259
The presence of that which we receive, unnecessary, for it is received by faith, and by faith only could it ever be received	260
But this faith is not independent or exclusive of Christ's ordinance	261
It works in connection with the word and ordinance of Christ	262
" Sacramental presence "	263
" Spiritual presence "	264
" Presence after a spiritual manner "	265
Spiritual presence of a material body impossible	266
" Virtual presence "	266
No virtual presence of that which does not exist	267

CHAPTER XVIII.

WHAT THE WICKED RECEIVE IN THE HOLY COMMUNION.

There is no real presence of the body and blood of Christ : they are received by faith and by faith only, and therefore they who are void of faith do not receive them	268
But there are distinctions to be made. The bread is and is not the body of Christ ; and the wine is and is not his blood : and it is in the sense in which the bread and wine are not his body and blood, that the wicked do not receive them	269
Yet even in that sense they are offered to all, but the offer is not necessarily accepted	269
There must be a capacity, and that is faith	269
Our Lord's words, Jno. vi. 54, 56, 53, show that those who have no life, have not eaten	270
Though they eat the outward Sacrament	271
Dr. Pusey's argument that they who have received the body and blood of Christ, may yet perish, examined and refuted	271
Archdeacon Denison's plea invalid	272
" Guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," does not prove that they receive, but that they profane them	273
Note on an extraordinary expression of Dr. Pusey	273
The Doctrine of the Church of England	274
Her warnings against receiving unworthily	275
The wicked do not partake of that body and blood of Christ, which the bread and wine are not	276

CHAPTER XIX.

ON EUCHARISTICAL ADORATION.

	PAGE
Mr. Keble's and Archdeacon Wilberforce's statements of the question: they ignore the very terms, "the body—and—blood of Christ"	277
The body and blood are not the living body	278
Christ everywhere to be adored; and to be adored even in the elements, if He were in them: but He is not in them	278
Alleged evidence from the Fathers and the Liturgies: Mr. Keble's argument: necessary caution as to the idea of the Real Presence	279
St. Cyril of Jerusalem	280
Remarks on his expression of "receiving the King"	281
St. Ambrose	282
St. Augustine	283
Remark of Bishop Andrewes on these Fathers	284
Theodoret	285
Rule of the Church England: she does not teach the Real Presence in the elements, and therefore does not teach adoration of Christ in them	286
Adores Him present, but not in the elements	287
The "Black Rubric" does not allow adoration of our Lord in them	288
So our great Divines teach that He is to be adored as present in the Eucharist; but they adore not his body and blood or his presence in the elements	288
—————	
Remarks on an expression of Mr. Keble, "the Person present by the presence of his body and blood"	289
Similar statements of Archdeacon Wilberforce	290
Alleged over-explaining of Hooker	290

CHAPTER XX.

ON COMMUNION IN ONE KIND, AND ADMINISTERING BOTH KINDS TOGETHER.

The circumstances of the institution not to be forgotten	292
Consequence of this in Roman doctrine	292
Denial of the cup, modern: alleged precedents in antiquity	293
Accidental omission	294
The Manichees first objected to the cup: but they were denounced	294
History of Communion in one kind	296
The bread sopped in the wine	297
Main incentive to Communion in one kind	297
Cases of concession of the cup: it was prohibited at Trent, and concession left to the Pope	297
Enquiry into the grounds for denial of the cup	298
Dr. Rock on Jno. vi.	298
Our Lord gave both kinds	300
Pretences of Roman Theologians	301
Our Lord at Emmaus	301
It is not, as Rome alleges, the same thing which is received under each kind	302
Administration of the bread dipped in the wine: the Liturgies: in seven the bread is dipped: in three the dipped bread is administered: in five the elements are administered separately	302
Inconsistency of the practice with our Lord's words	303
It changes the Sacrament: caution with regard to the Eastern Church, which follows it	303

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

THE EUCHARIST A FEAST UPON A SACRIFICE.

	PAGE
Our Lord's words on the necessity and benefits of eating his flesh and drinking his blood: and He has taught us how to do this, by the institution of the Sacrament	305
By doing this we feast on his Sacrifice	306
The Jewish sacrifices: correspondence of our Lord's sacrifice to them	306
His sacrifice never to be repeated, and not continuous	307
In the Eucharist we feast on a sacrifice made once for all by Christ, and not on a sacrifice made by us: and the Eucharist a proof of his sacrifice	308
The Eucharist is a feast: enquiry what is the subject of the feast	308

CHAPTER II.

REVIEW OF OBJECTIONS BY BICKERSTETH AND OTHERS; HICKES, JOHNSON, AND MOSHEIM: AND THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

Mr. Bickersteth's objections	310
Charge of novelty: the doctrine not novel if Scriptural: opinions of the Fathers	312
Hickes' objections	314
Johnson's	314
The Eucharist is not a literal, but a spiritual feast	315
Johnson's doctrine	315
His shocking words on our Lord's death	316
Mosheim's objections	317
They are dissolved by the fact that it is not a literal feast we partake of	318
The objections of the Tracts for the Times	319
The power of our Lord's sacrifice is for ever: it was the only real and true sacrifice; and our feast on it is real	320
We partake of the elements, but this is not a feast: we partake of the body and blood of Christ, and this is the feast	321

CHAPTER III.

FOUR THEORIES OF MATERIAL SACRIFICE IN THE EUCHARIST.

Mede's theory: the great authority for a material sacrifice, before consecration	322
Johnson's theory: sacrifice of the elements made the body and blood of Christ, by union with the Holy Spirit	323
Nineteenth century doctrine of material sacrifice	325
The Roman theory	327

CHAPTER IV.

DEFINITION OF SACRIFICE.

It is not of sacrifice in general, but of Scriptural sacrifice	329
Difference between sacrifices and oblations	330

	PAGE
In sacrifice there is a destruction of life or being	330
Rule of sacrifices	330
Sacrifice is for sin: it is a confession of sin, and profession of faith and hope	331
Definition of material sacrifice	333
Examination of other definitions: St. Augustine's; Aquinas'	333
Definition by Bellarmine, 334: excludes the sacrifices of the Old Testament; unsupported by sufficient proof, 335: unscriptural, 336: though framed to favour the mass, is opposed to it, 336: not reconcilable with the definition of Trent	337
More important variance with Roman doctrine	338
His definition opposed to the sacrifice of the cross	338
Mede's definition	339
Johnson's	340
His definition as well as Bellarmine's opposed to the sacrifice of the cross	342
Bread and wine alone were not a sacrifice of the law	343
Manducation of a sacrifice is not sacrifice	344
Thorndike says the elements are properly oblations, improperly sacrifices	344
Archdeacon Wilberforce's definition	345
Mr. Medd's	346
The Ecclesiastic	346
All these theories only beg the question	347

CHAPTER V.

PASSAGES OF HOLY SCRIPTURE WHICH ARE ALLEGED FOR A MATERIAL SACRIFICE IN THE EUCHARIST.

Distinction between the service and the elements of the Eucharist	348
Five places only alleged for a direct proof	348
Mal. i. 11. Mede's interpretation	349
But "incense" and "Mincha" must be taken, both, either spiritually or literally: and spiritual incense and offering agreeable to Scripture	349
Roman versions	350
"Incense and a pure offering": no offerings of the law called pure, not even the "Mincha": the same things pure under the law and the Gospel	350
The purity spoken of could not belong to any material offering: and the offering could not be of any material thing	351
The Mincha was not mere bread and wine, but of fine flour, &c., with oil and salt, and sometimes frankincense; and not with wine	352
What is the "pure offering"	352
Many pure offerings made by Christians	353
The Fathers were not unanimous in their opinions of the "pure offering"	353
Tertullian's opinion	353
Opinions of Eusebius and Jerome	354
Mat. vi. 23, 24. Mede's argument	355
The place not to be confined to Christians, but to have application at the time and thenceforth	356
The Christian Altar. The Gospel has spiritual sacrifices, a spiritual priesthood, and a spiritual altar	357
The altar to be proved by the sacrifices	357
The records of the institution of the Eucharist	358
Mede's construction	358
But bread and wine were not a meat offering	359
Johnson's argument of our Lord's offering of Himself in the institution	359

	PAGE
It is not true that He did actually offer Himself in it	360
His body was devoted, but not given then	360
He being alive gave his dead body	361
Our Lord in the institution is not said to have offered or sacrificed either Him- self or the elements	362
His offering and sacrifice of Himself done only on the cross	363
Jer. Taylor on the sacrifice of Himself in the Eucharist	363
On the meaning of the word <i>ποιεῖν</i>	364
Heb. v. 10. The order of Melchisedek	365
Line of argument necessary to show a material sacrifice in the Eucharist from Melchisedek	365
Examination of it	366
"Offered" or "brought forth." Gen. xiv. 18, 19	367
Bellarmino's attempt	367
Unsupported by the Hebrew; and his argument careless and inconsistent	367
Opinions of St. Augustine and St. Cyprian	369
Josephus and Philo	369
The Hebrew particle is copulative	370
It is probable that Melchisedek offered sacrifice on meeting Abraham; but only probable	371
We are never told that bread and wine were used as a sacrifice to God	372
Offering of Cain and Abel	372
Cain's rejected because it had no shedding of blood	373
The assertion that a priest after the order of Melchisedek must offer bread and wine	373
The interpretation of "Thou art a priest for ever," &c.	373
Christian Priests wrongly asserted to be after the order of Melchisedek	374
The Ep. to the Heb. does not refer to a sacrifice of Melchisedek	376
The silence unaccountable, if the writer intended any correspondence between Melchisedek and Christ as to sacrifice	376
Melchisedek himself a type of Christ, but his bread and wine not a type of any offering by Christ	378
Divine authority alone can make the relations of type and antitype	378
Definitions of a type	379
Johnson's arguments on the silence in Heb.	379
It is the perpetuity of our Lord's priesthood which makes Him a priest after the order of Melchisedek	382

CHAPTER VI.

OPINIONS OF THE ANCIENT FATHERS ON MELCHISEDEK'S ALLEGED SACRIFICE.

No mention in the Bible of any sacrifice of Melchisedek	384
The authority of the Fathers cannot make a type	384
Distinction of doctrines put forth merely as their own, from those which they ascribe to the Church	384
Opinions of Clem. Alex., Cyprian, 385; Eusebius Cæs., 386; Ambrose, 387; Jerome, Augustine, 388; Chrysostom, Theodoret, Arnobius jun., Cassio- dorus, Primasius, 389; Joannes Damasc., Œcumenius, 390; Theophylact	391
Analysis of their opinions	391
There is next to nothing in them to show that they regarded the bread and wine of Melchisedek as a sacrifice	394
No proof, therefore, that they are a type of a sacrifice, proving a sacrifice of them in the Eucharist	395
Heb. xiii. 10 does not prove a material altar. A material altar is for a sacrifice by fire. The priesthood being changed, so are the sacrifices	396

CHAPTER VII.

THE TEACHING OF THE FATHERS ON THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

	PAGE
Did they believe a sacrifice of the bread and wine?	398
It is not sufficient to heap up places from many centuries, and to put them forth as the opinion of antiquity	398
Evidence must be carefully traced from the first	399
Clem. Rom. 399; Ignatius, 400; Justin Martyr, 401; Irenæus, 403; Tertullian, 405; Negative evidence: Justin Martyr, 406; St. Barnabas, Athenagoras, 407; Irenæus, Tertullian, 408; Minucius Felix, Clem. Alex., Origen, 409; they repudiated material sacrifices	410
Enumeration of sacrifices by St. Chrysostom, excluded material sacrifices	412
The practice of the Church: Justin Martyr's account of the Eucharist, 414; Cyril's of Jerusalem; have nothing of oblation or sacrifice of the elements	414
A gradual advance from primitive doctrine and practice	416
Special notice on Archdeacon Wilberforce's opinion, which is shown to be illogical and inconclusive	419
The Eucharist was held to be a sacrifice by the ancient Church; but that it held the elements to be a sacrifice, has not been proved	419
Illicit process in argument from oblation to sacrifice	420

CHAPTER VIII.

ON THE ALLEGED SACRIFICE OF THE "SACRAMENTUM" WITH THE
"RES SACRAMENTI."

The sacrifices with respect to the elements, which are claimed as the system of Mede, of the nineteenth century, and of Rome	421
The Res Sacramenti of these theories is not the same	422
Of Johnson's theory, it is the Holy Spirit	422
His alleged evidence from the ancients	424
Theodoret and Cyril Alex., Chrysostom, 425; Augustine, 426; Gaudentius, 427; Ephrem Syrus, 428; Ambrose, 429; Gregory Nyssen, 430; Optatus, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, 431; Cyril of Jerusalem, 432; Julius Firmicus, Gelasius, 433; The Liturgies	434
No change conceived in the nature or substance of the elements; nor any imagination that the body and blood of Christ was in them, though, in a sense, they were his body and blood	436
The Holy Spirit was invoked to make them what they were called; but no in- fusion of the Spirit into them imagined: and so far as requisite, they were what they were called	437
What the evidence brought by Johnson amounts to: but first it is necessary to observe that such testimonies must not be used cumulatively, as the evidence of Scripture; but taken only so far as they all agree	437
Examination of the evidence of Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, and the Liturgies	438
Difference of language in the Liturgies before and after the consecration	442
They had no sacrifice of the elements or the sacramentum, or of the Spirit with them as the Res Sacramenti	444
In the Tractarian and Roman systems, the Res Sacramenti is the body and blood of Christ, or rather Christ Himself	445
But He cannot be offered	447
The "Continuous Sacrifice"	448
Memorial addressed to Archbishop Longley by Mr. Carter and others	448

	PAGE
History of the doctrine: it is traced no farther back than to Archdeacon Manning	449
Not found in Aquinas or Bellarmine	449
Aquinas had no thought of the continuous sacrifice	451
Bellarmino held a continual offering on earth	452
Growth of Roman errors on this subject and others	453
Opinions of English divines	454
Waterland, Field, Taylor	454
Cosin, Jolly	455
Phillipotts	456
Archdeacon Manning considered to be the first who broached the doctrine of the "continuous sacrifice"	456
Archdeacon Wilberforce followed	457
Observations of Bellarmine	458
A nearer approach by Harding	459
The doctrine an addition to Roman doctrine	460
Correspondence of Mr. Marriott and Mr. Carter	460
"Tracts for the Day"	461
The doctrine briefly described	462
Its supposed foundations examined	463
Christ offered once for all	464
And by that one offering made "a priest for ever"	465
His priesthood imposes no necessity that He should offer sacrifice any more	465
He offered Himself once, and by his offering "obtained eternal redemption for us"	466
Plea of Mr. Carter from Rev. v. 6, "a lamb as it had been slain"	466
But He was not offering: He was standing not before an altar, but "before the throne"	467
Another plea from Heb. ix. 24, "appearing in the presence of God for us"	467
Another argument from the High Priest entering with the blood into the Holy of Holies	468
Examination of this type: its signification opened out in Ep. to Hebrews	469
Our Lord was not "in a victim state" during the forty days after his resurrection: and He ascended not as one to offer, but as one who had offered	471
Mr. Shipley's argument	471
Mr. Carter is refuted by Mr. Marriott	472
The true doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ	472

CHAPTER IX.

THE TRUE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

The Eucharist is a feast, not on the elements, but on that which they signify	474
None could offer Christ, but Himself	475
We have no material sacrifices imposed upon us, but we have spiritual sacrifices to offer	475
The sacrifice of confession and contrition, 476; of faith, of thanksgiving, 477; of ourselves, of all that we have, of prayers, intercessions, and thanks for all men	477
In addition to these sacrifices we may add material oblations	477
The spiritual sacrifices are the true Eucharistic Sacrifice	477

CHAPTER X.

ON OBLATIONS IN THE HOLY COMMUNION.

	PAGE
Oblations in the Church at Jerusalem	479
Made with prayer ; religiously presented for Divine acceptance	480
Accounts by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian	480
Oblations of bread and wine ; out of which were taken the elements for the Sacrament	481
Citations from Tertullian and Cyprian	481
Chrysostom. Justin Martyr's account of the celebration of the Sacrament : no oblation of the elements found in it	482
Nor in that given by Cyril of Jerusalem	483
Oblation of the elements as such, not necessary to the validity of the Sacrament	483
No oblation in our "Communion of the Sick"	483
We must not make that essential, which is not	483
In the practice of the Church, the elements are not sacrificed	485
No sacrifice or oblation of them is to be implied in our Lord's words or action	485
The elements are not to be set forth as an adjunct to a Jewish sacrifice	486
No trace of oblation or sacrifice of the elements found in the New Testament, or in the early records of the Church	486
Our Lord has commanded them to be taken ; He has not commanded them to be offered	487
They may be a memorial of a larger oblation ; but they are, with whatsoever legitimate ceremonies ordained by the Church, to be ready for consecration	488
The mind of the Church of England : the Prayer for the Church Militant, and the previous Rubric	488
The bason with the alms directed to be "reverently" brought, and "humbly" presented and placed upon the Table : but of the elements it is said merely that the priest shall place them upon the Table	489
What is the intention of the Church?	490
Second Book of Ed. VI.	490
Proposal to insert in our Rubric a direction that the Priest should "offer up" the elements, rejected at the last revision	490
Rubric of the Prayer for the Church Militant	491
Intention of our Church to restore "the godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers," who, as has been seen, had no special oblation of the elements	492
Testimony of Clement of Rome, 492 ; of Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom	493
The true primitive practice	494
Evidence of the Liturgies	494
An appeal to them useless on this subject	495
The English Liturgy has no verbal oblation of the elements	495
It is not contended that there is no oblation of them in any sense ; but that the oblation of them is not an essential part of the sacramental rite	496
Our altar is for spiritual sacrifices and for such oblations as may fitly accompany them	497
Our Priesthood corresponds to the Altar and its Sacrifices	499

CHAPTER XI.

CONCLUSION.

Part I.	500
Part II.	507

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

	PAGE
On the "large upper room." It would be the same in which the Apostles assembled after the institution, and to which they returned after the Ascension: the "house" in which they broke "the bread." It was afterwards enclosed with a good Church, known by the name of the Church of Sion	511

APPENDIX B.

The Sacrament is not to be consecrated without wine, or one element without the other	514
---	-----

APPENDIX C.

Meaning of Sacramentum	516
----------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX D.

On the expression in the Homily: "no untrue figure of a thing absent"	517
---	-----

APPENDIX E.

Peter Lombard on the Sacraments	518
---	-----

APPENDIX F.

Application of the name, and number of the Sacraments	519
Brief history with regard to the number	520
Only two Sacraments held at first, 520; Luther held three: Hugo de S. Victore and Peter Lombard, the first who held seven	521
Doctrine of the Church of England	521

APPENDIX G.

On the name "Quakers"	522
---------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX H.

	PAGE
The reception of disciples in baptism with water by our Lord. Quaker objections. Our Lord baptized not; but his disciples baptized with water by his authority, and it was understood to be his act	523

APPENDIX I.

The necessity of water in baptism	525
---	-----

APPENDIX K.

Connection of St. John vi. 32-63 with the institution of the Eucharist	525
--	-----

APPENDIX L.

The necessity of using the means appointed for eating the flesh, and drinking the blood of Christ	526
---	-----

APPENDIX M.

The way in which the true believer is instructed that he is to eat and drink the flesh and blood of Christ	527
Mr. Gurney on feeding spiritually	527
Spiritual eating and drinking, indeed, have no necessary connection with any external ceremony: for that would come to the doctrine of the "opus operatum"	528
Note on the "opus operatum"	528
But the connection between the grace and the rite is strong enough for faith	530
Sacraments themselves will not save; but will they who reject them live? No light thing to reject any Divine ordinance	530
We are to eat the bread because the Lord said it is his body, and to drink the wine because He said it is his blood	531

APPENDIX N.

L'Arroque's account of the origin of the mixed cup	532
--	-----

APPENDIX O.

The supposed symbolisms of the mixed cup	533
Statement of them from St. Cyprian	533
Note from the "Library of the Fathers"	534
Summary of the symbolisms	536
They are not Catholic, nor Scriptural	537
To find and to introduce mystical significations are different	537
True doctrinal uses of the Sacraments	538
The Trent reasons for the mixed cup	539
Romanist speculations on the mixed cup	540

APPENDIX P.

	PAGE
Defective doctrines of the Eucharist	540
Zuingle, 540; Socinus, 541; Remonstrants, Doddridge, Wesley, 542; Dwight	543

APPENDIX Q.

The decree of transubstantiation	543
--	-----

APPENDIX S.

Archbishop Bramhall's catalogue of the questions and debates which arose from transubstantiation	544
References to arguments in our great Divines against transubstantiation, from the reason and nature of things	546
Remarks of Archbishop Cranmer, 547; of Tracts against Popery, and Leslie	548
Mr. Stanley Faber's opinion that transubstantiation is a question of extrinsic evidence: his opinion controverted	518
"Truth in what kind soever is by no truth gainsaid"	550

APPENDIX R.

From an admission that the species may still be called bread and wine	550
---	-----

APPENDIX S.

On our Lord's coming out of the tomb; on his entering the room when the doors were shut; and on his vanishing out of sight at Emmaus	551
Outline of the facts of the resurrection, 551. The entrance when the doors were shut	554
His entrance through the substance of the door remaining shut, would have been evidence against his resurrection or the truth of his body	554
Note on the opinions of the Fathers	556
"He vanished out of their sight." It is not explained how; and it may be differently accounted for	558
A miracle confessed in all the three cases; but it is not known, neither can it be confidently stated, in what the miracle consisted	559
The alleged miracles might be believed, if they had been declared	560
But they are, at best, only probable; and probability is no foundation for doctrine	561
Nor, if they were certainly proved, would they be sufficient to show that our Lord's body could be in more places than one	561

APPENDIX T.

	PAGE
Consubstantiation	562
Luther's statement of his doctrine	562
Confession of Augsburg, Melancthon's Apology, Gerhard	564
Trent decree "de usu admirabilis hujus Sacramenti"	566
Mosheim, Gerhard, the Augsburg Confession, and Melancthon's Apology	567
Comment of St. Augustine	568
Ubiquity, and St. Augustine upon it	568
Hooker on the retention by each nature in the Person of Christ of its distinct properties	569

APPENDIX V.

The Roman Canon of the Mass, and conversion of the substances	571
The Canon, and how it differs from the true words	571
Bellarmino on the kinds of conversion	572
But he, and those who defend transubstantiation, may give explanations, and yet leave the subject as incredible as they find it	574

APPENDIX W.

We eat not a living but a dead body	575
---	-----

APPENDIX X.

The bread is, and is not, the body of Christ: the wine is, and is not, the blood of Christ	575
Citation from Archdeacon Freeman in connection with this statement	575
Remarks on the Archdeacon's opinion	577

APPENDIX Y.

On the steeped Eucharist	577
Decree of the Council of Braga, 577; of another Council under Urban II.	578

APPENDIX Z.

The use of the steeped Eucharist leading to the disuse of the cup	578
The steps by which the disuse of the cup came about	578
Constitutions of Archbishop Peckham, that whole Christ was given under the species of bread	579
Coronation of Richard II.	580

APPENDIX A A.

The decree of the Council of Constance for disuse of the cup	580
The decree	580
Opposed to two Popes before	582

APPENDIX B B.

	PAGE
The concession of the cup to the Bohemians	582
Granted also to the Moravians, to the king of England, Ed. III.	582
Charles V. permitted it; Ferdinand of Hungary, and Albert of Bavaria, granted it	583
Petitions to the Council of Trent for it, 583; but the Council at length left it to the discretion of the Pope	584
Custom at coronation of the French kings	584
Proposal of the Pope to sanction our Liturgy	584

APPENDIX C C.

Relaxation of the Constance decree by the Pope in favour of deacons and others	584
Testimonies given by J'Arroque from Cassander	584

APPENDIX D D.

On the breaking of bread at Emmaus	585
--	-----

APPENDIX E E.

On the time when our Lord offered Himself	586
Mr. Milton's opinion that He offered the lamb at the Passover, and with it offered Himself	586
It is unfounded on Scripture, and untheological	589
Our Lord never offered any sacrifice but of Himself	590
The distinction is not true between the sacrifice of the spirit and soul, and the sacrifice of the body	590
The feast on his sacrifice being spiritual, could be before as well as after He suffered	591
The feast is on his body given for us, and his blood shed for us; and the feast could never be but by faith	591

APPENDIX F F.

On the use of the word <i>πρωτόειρε</i>	592
Mr. Malan's observations	592
His observations from Chrysostom on the "continuous sacrifice"	593

APPENDIX G G.

Archdeacon Freeman on Cain's sacrifice	594
But Abel's a "larger" sacrifice than Cain's, because it had shedding of blood	595

APPENDIX H H.

	PAGE
Our Lord offered no sacrifice but of Himself	595
He had no sin to offer for, and therefore could not offer	595
To say that He offered sacrifices of the law is to impute sin to Him	596

APPENDIX I I.

On the alleged sacrifice of Melchisedek	596
Canon Trevor's remarks, showing that Cyprian was the first to take the alleged sacrifice for a type of the Eucharistic sacrifice	596
Citation from Outram	597
Letter of the late Dr. Burton on the order of Melchisedek, and on Malachi i. 11	598

APPENDIX K K.

The body and blood of Christ are not whole Christ	600
Inaccurate words of Clement of Alexandria, Dionysius of Alexandria, and St. Augustine	600
Passage imputed to Overall by Knox	600
We must not deny that Christ had a soul as well as flesh—this were heresy	601

THE
TRUE DOCTRINE
OF
THE EUCHARIST.



PART I.

CHAPTER I.

NAMES OF THIS HOLY RITE.

THIS RITE of the Church of Christ has many different appellations,¹ of which some are found in Holy Scripture, and others are derived from its real or supposed nature and uses.²

The first mention we find of it, after the ascension of our Lord, is under the name of “BREAKING OF BREAD” in Acts ii. 42, where we are informed that the multitude of converts “continued stedfastly in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.” Some commentators and divines, indeed, are doubtful whether the Sacrament is here meant by the expression, “breaking of bread;” especially because it is said in the forty-fourth and forty-sixth verses, that “all that believed had all things common;—and continuing daily with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread from house to house,* did

¹ “Nihil prohibet idem pluribus nominibus nominari secundum diversas proprietates et effectus.” Nothing forbids that the same thing should be called by many names according to its diverse properties and effects.—Aquinas, 3a. q. 73, art. 4. 2^o.

² For the names of this Sacrament, see Waterland’s Review of the Eucharist, c. i. Works, Oxford, 1823, vii. 20, &c.; also Casaubon’s Exercitationes ad Baron. Prolegom. An. xxxiv. Numm. xlv.—lxxiii. Genev. 1655, pp. 441–517; and Suicer. Thesaur. in vocc. δειπνον, εὐχαριστία, θυσία, κλάσις, κοινωνία, μυστήριον, προσφορά, κ.τ.λ.; Albertin. de Euch. Sacramento, Daventriæ, 1654, I. i.; Binchii Mellificium Theologicum, Amstelodami, 1658, Loc. XXVII. i.; Hospinian. Historiæ Sacramentariæ, Tigur. 1598, I. ix. 175.

* See Appendix A.

eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart," where it seems clear that by "breaking of bread" is meant a partaking of ordinary food.

Now this appears to me to be one of the many instances, in which objections are founded on an ambiguity in the English, when a reference to the Greek would at once show that there is no ground whatever for them. For, on looking at the original, it is instantly plain, that the more accurate translation would be "they continued steadfastly in the doctrine of the apostles, and in the fellowship, and in the breaking of the bread, and in the prayers;" or—"in the doctrine and fellowship of the apostles, and in their breaking of the bread, and in their prayers;" that is, not merely in the doctrine and fellowship of the apostles, but also in their breaking of the bread,—the sacramental bread,³—and in their prayers,—the prayers spoken by them. For, wherever common bread is meant, the word is used without the article, unless there be a reference to some bread previously mentioned. Thus in St. Mark vii. 2, "when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, unwashen hands," the word is without the article: but in the fifth verse, where we read, "why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands?" it is "*the* bread,"—the bread which they had seen them thus eat.

We may add that if St. Luke had meant common bread in Acts ii. 42, as well as in the forty-sixth verse, he would, doubtless, have omitted the article in the former, and have inserted it in the latter; instead of doing the very contrary, as he has done. And the connection in which it occurs in the forty-second verse, I cannot but think, is a sufficient proof of the matter in question. For the sacred writer would hardly have introduced a reference to their common meals, between "the apostles' doctrine and fellowship," and their "prayers;" particularly when he was about to make mention, a verse or two afterwards, of their "breaking bread from house to house and eating their meat."

The unwillingness of some to interpret the passage as meaning the Lord's Supper, seems to have arisen from this: that some controversialists of the Church of Rome have endeavoured to draw an argument from the place so interpreted, in favour of their practice of communion in one kind only. But, as has been

³ The Syriac version (which is of great antiquity) renders it "breaking of the Eucharist."—Waterland, Rev. Works, 1823; vii. 20; Mede, Discourse on Churches. Works, Lond. 1664, ii. 409.

well remarked,* if it be argued from there being no mention of wine, that the Sacrament was *celebrated* or *administered* without it, it must be admitted that it was *consecrated* also without it; and as the Church of Rome maintains, and that rightly, that the Sacrament ought not to be consecrated without wine,† the argument for communion in one kind altogether fails. No real difficulty, therefore, or impediment, is occasioned by the Romanist application of the place.

In accordance with this name, of “breaking of bread,” we find, Acts xx. 7, the disciples coming “together on the first day of the week to break bread:” and St. Paul speaks ‡ of this Sacrament, as “the bread, which we break, and the cup of blessing, which we bless.” In the former place, it is true, the word “bread” is without the article: but the circumstances are sufficient to show what bread is meant: for it was “on the first day of the week,” the Lord’s day, that “the disciples came together;” their assembly was for the special purpose of breaking bread; and preaching was a part of what was transacted in that assembly: all which circumstances indicate the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, and agree but little with the enjoyment of a common meal. We do not elsewhere find that the disciples met together in this manner to partake of a common meal; but we do find, from St. Paul’s remonstrances with the Corinthians, § that they did come thus together to celebrate this Sacrament.

The designation of “THE LORD’S SUPPER” is taken from the place just now referred to, where St. Paul says: “when ye come together into one place, this is not to eat the Lord’s Supper.” This name was adopted for the rite, because our Lord Jesus Christ and his disciples were eating the supper of the Passover,⁴ (Matt. xxvi. 26) when He instituted it, and because He used for it the viands of which they had been partaking.

Some, however, as Thorndike,⁵ think that “the Lord’s Supper” in the meaning of the apostle, comprehended the Agape or Love-feast, as well as the Sacrament: taking the

* Whitby, in loc. † See Appendix B.

‡ 1 Cor. x. 16. § 1 Cor. xi. 18, 20-34.

⁴ “Vetustissimi quidem patres, Apostoli auctoritatem secuti, cœnæ etiam nomine sacram Eucharistiam interdum vocarunt, quod in illo novissimæ cœnæ salutari mysterio a Christo Domino sit instituta.” —Cat. Conc. Trid. de Euch. v.

⁵ “The most eminent fathers, indeed, following the authority of the apostle, have sometimes called the sacred Eucharist by the name even of the Supper, because it was instituted by Christ the Lord in that saving mystery of his last supper.”

⁵ Review of the Service of God at Religious Assemblies, Works, Oxford, 1844, I. 859.

name to mean the whole transaction, and calling the Agape the Lord's Supper, and the holy rite, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But since there is no record that our Lord instituted the Love-feast, while He did institute the Sacrament at his last supper, it would seem unreasonable to give the name to the Agape, and refuse it to his own institution.

The Church of England has adopted this name for the Sacrament, and her divines and members generally have followed her example. But of late years a party has sprung up, some of whom have objected to the name as "the cause at the present day of much misconception:" just as Dens objects to it as opposed to the precept, that the Sacrament should be taken fasting.* The misconception, I suppose, is in views of the Sacrament, inconsistent with their doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. But even the Supper and their Eucharistic Sacrifice are not inconsistent; for that, which they suppose to be sacrificed, is eaten by our Lord's command.

St. Paul has also said: "the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"† Therefore also this Sacrament is called **THE COMMUNION OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST.**

About forty years after (A.D. 96), it was called **OBLATION**; because at its celebration gifts were offered, consisting "partly of alms for the poor, and partly of oblations to the Church;" and out of these oblations the bread and wine were taken. So ancient, we may observe by the way, is the practice followed by our own Church, which directs "alms for the poor and other devotions of the people" to be collected in the Communion; and when the bread and wine have been placed upon the table, puts into our mouths the prayer that God would "most mercifully accept our alms and oblations, and receive our prayers, which we offer unto his Divine Majesty." There is also an offering up of ourselves to God, as we say in the Post-Communion. "And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee." For it was deemed "one great part of this office to dedicate ourselves to God," in humble acknowledgment of the inestimable benefits, represented and conveyed to us in this Sacrament, according to these words of St. Paul:

* The Ecclesiastic, viii. 302, Dens, Theologia: De Eucharistia, Dublin, 1832, I. i. p. 251.

† 1 Cor. x. 16.

“I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.”*

The name of SACRAMENT seems to have been given to it about the year of our Lord 104; as we find from the celebrated letter of Pliny to Trajan, where he says that “the Christians, meeting on a certain day, bound themselves by a Sacrament, to commit no wickedness, but to lead good lives:” for as Pliny there repeated what the Christians had told him, it is reasonable to judge, that they had made use of the word Sacrament to him, which they understood in a Christian sense, however Pliny or Trajan might take it.† They might use it as an illustration to show that the holy rite imposed as strong an obligation upon them as the Sacramentum which bound the Romans to the duties with which it was connected: that it was in a way, to them, what the Sacramentum was to the Romans.‡

Very soon afterwards we find it called by the name of EUCHARIST, which signifies Thanksgiving: and this name was given to it because the giving of thanks and praise was considered an indispensable part of the service:—the Church herein following the example of our blessed Saviour Himself; of whom the sacred writers inform us, that when He ordained this holy mystery, He gave thanks before He brake the bread, and likewise also when He took the cup. The homily of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament, § says that “the godly Fathers named it Eucharistia; as if they should have said, now, above all other times, ye ought to laud and praise God. Now you may behold the matter, the cause, the beginning, and the end of all thanksgiving. Now, if you slack, ye show yourselves most unthankful, and that no other benefit can ever stir you to thank God, who so little regard here so many, so wonderful, and so profitable benefits.” And in this particular, again, we may perceive how close our Church keeps to the scriptural and primitive pattern: for both in and after the celebration of the Communion, there is a hymn of praise, “lauding and magnifying God’s holy name,” and “giving thanks to Him for his great glory.”

It was also called by the names of MEMORIAL and COMMEMORATION, signifying some of the objects for which it was ap-

* Rom. xii. 1.

† Waterland’s Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist. Works, Oxford, 1823, VII. 32.

‡ See Appendix C.

§ Second Part, near the beginning.

pointed, according to the injunction : “ Do this in remembrance of Me ;” and according to the declaration of the apostle, that “ as often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we do shew the Lord’s death till He come.”*

And, lastly, it was called SACRIFICE and PASSOVER :—SACRIFICE, because we make in the celebration of it a “ sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,” as our Prayer Book expresses it ; and because it is the memorial and commemoration of the one oblation of Himself offered once for all, by which our Saviour Christ did make “ a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world :”—PASSOVER, because, as not only the ceremony itself which was observed by the Israelites on the night when they went out of Egypt, but also its annual feast or commemoration, was called the Passover ; and Christ was called and is our true Passover, which was sacrificed for our deliverance from spiritual bondage : so might the commemoration of his sacrifice be called by the same name.

Other appellations were given in the course of time to this Sacrament ;⁶ but these which I have mentioned are the earliest, the most considerable, and the most appropriate. Let us just glance at the manner in which our own Church speaks of it.

The formal designation of it in our Liturgy is, the Lord’s Supper, or the Holy Communion ; or, as in the running title of the office, the Communion. In the Catechism and the Thirty-nine Articles, it is called the Supper of the Lord. In the Communion Service, it is spoken of as “ the most comfortable Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ ;” “ the holy com-

* 1 Cor. xi. 26.

⁶ In the Church of Rome it is called VIATICUM, “ because it offers to us here a way of reaching heaven ” (Dens, v. 251) : and, most commonly, THE MASS ; on which name Bishop Morton says :—

“ Nomen Missa secum omen suum apportat, quod cum a dimittendis iis qui Eucharistiæ participes esse nolunt, ortum suum traxerit, Romanam Missam plæne jugulat, quæ (veluti Amasios suos) spectatores meros omnibus lenociniis ad se allicit atque invitat ; ac si in illo uno theatrico Spectaculo Religio ipsa Christiana fere tota consisteret : quos tamen (modo Eucharistiæ capaces) antiquitas Catholica apud Græcos ἀπέλθειν, apud Latinos discedere jussit.”—De Euch. Epist. Dedicat. ii.

“ The name Mass bears its own omen, because, since it drew its origin from sending away those who desire not to be partakers of the Eucharist, it plainly destroys the Roman Mass, which (as [a woman does] her gallants) entices and invites to itself mere spectators by every allurements ; as if almost the whole Christian religion consisted in that one theatrical show : and yet these people (if admissible to the Eucharist) Catholic antiquity amongst the Greeks ordered to go away, and amongst the Latins to depart.”

munion of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ ;” “ holy mysteries, and a heavenly feast,” in which we receive “ pledges of his love,” and set forth a “ remembrance of his death to our great and endless comfort.”

In the Homilies, it is termed “ a mystery of peace, and Sacrament of Christian Society ;” “ high mysteries ;” “ sacred and fearful mysteries ;” “ the reverend communion ;” “ a celestial banquet and feast ;” “ a heavenly memory of the death and passion of Christ.” In the office for the Communion it is also said to be a divine and comfortable thing to them who receive it worthily, and dangerous to them that will presume to receive it unworthily.*

The Homily thus expatiates upon the Sacrament: “ in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent ; † but, as the Scripture saith, the Table of the Lord ; the Bread and Cup of the Lord ; the Memory of Christ ; the Annunciation of his death ; yea, the Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation ; which, by the operation of the Holy Ghost—the very bond of our conjunction with Christ—is, through faith, wrought into the souls of the faithful ; whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely win to their bodies a resurrection to immortality. The true understanding of this fruition and union, which is betwixt the body and the head, betwixt the true believers and Christ,—the ancient Catholic fathers, both perceiving themselves, and commending to their people, were not afraid to call this supper ; some of them, the Salve of Immortality, and Sovereign Preservative against Death ; other, a Deifical Communion ; other, the Sweet Dainties of our Saviour, the Pledge of Eternal Health, the Defence of Faith, the Hope of the Resurrection ; other, the Food of Immortality, the Healthful Grace, and the Conservatory to Everlasting Life.”

And lastly, one of our most esteemed divines, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, says that there are some who, “ both in their right and in their wrong, enumerate many glories of the Holy Sacrament, which they usually signify in these excellent appellations, calling it—the Bread of elect souls, and the Wine of angels, the New Testament, and the Chalice of benediction, Spiritual food, the Great supper, the Divinest and Archisymbolical

* Homily of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament.

† See Appendix D.

feast, the Banquet of the Church, the Celestial dinner, the Spiritual, the Sacred, the Mystical, the Formidable, the Rational Table, the Supersubstantial bread, the Bread of God, the Bread of life, the Lord's 'mystery, the great Mystery of salvation, the Lord's sacrament, the Sacrament of piety, the Sign of unity, the Contessaration of the Christian communion, the Divine grace, the Divine-making grace, the Holy thing, the Desirable, the Communication of God, the Perfection and Consummation of a Christian, the Holy particles, the Gracious symbols, the Holy gifts, the Sacrifice of commemoration, the Intellectual and Mystical good, the Hereditary donation of the New Testament, the Sacrament of the Lord's body, the Sacrament of the chalice, the Paschal oblation, the Christian Passport, the Mystery of perfection, the Great oblation, the Worship of God, the Life of souls, the Sacrament of our price and our Redemption."*

* Worthy Communicant, Lond. 1683, I. i. 14.

CHAPTER II.

SACRAMENTS. OUTWARD SIGNS NOT ABOLISHED BY THE GOSPEL,
BUT ORDAINED IN IT.

IT has been stated that SACRAMENT is one of the names of the Eucharist. But the name is not confined to it. In a wide or improper sense it is applied to various other rites; while, in its proper sense, it embraces Baptism and the Eucharist only.

The Catechism of the Church of England, and its other authentic documents, teach that the Lord's Supper is one of those two Sacraments,⁷ which "Christ has ordained in his Church as generally necessary to Salvation." And a Sacrament, in this sense, is defined to be "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."*

According to this definition, then, there is, first, an outward and visible sign, ordained by Christ Himself, that is, by Christ Himself, personally, and in the time of his sojourning among us; secondly, there is an inward and spiritual grace given to us; thirdly, the outward sign is a means whereby we receive the inward grace, and a pledge to assure us of it; fourthly, the Sacraments are ordained by Christ in his Church; and fifthly, they are generally necessary to salvation.⁸

⁷ "The two ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper existed before such a systematic definition of the two Sacraments had been formed as to include both.—As Tertullian, generally speaking, is the author of the later dogmatic terminology (comp. the phrases, *Novum Testamentum*, *trinitas*, *peccatum originale*, *satisfactio*), so *he* is the first writer who uses the term *Sacramentum* *Baptismatis et Eucharistiæ*, *adv. Marc.*"—Hagenback, *History of Doctrines*, lxxiv. I. 205; Clarke's *Foreign Theol. Library*.

* See Appendix E.

⁸ It is necessary, however, to notice that the word Sacrament is very commonly used sometimes for the outward signs, sometimes for the sign and the thing signified, and sometimes for "the whole ministration and receiving of the Sacraments."—Cranmer on the Lord's Supper, I.; Pref. Parker Society's Ed.

The Augsburg Confession defines Sacraments thus:—"Signs and testimonies of God's will towards us, by which God moves our hearts to believe." Calvin says:—"We hold Sacraments to be for testimonies of the grace of God, that it may be more and more confirmed to us, and also for external signs and marks by which we profess Christianity before men."—*Confessio Fidei Nomine Ecclesiarum Gallicæ*, Ep., Amstelodami, 1667, p. 251.

The Church of Rome adopts a looser definition, for the purpose of increasing the number of the Sacraments: sometimes calling a Sacrament “a visible sign of an invisible grace, appointed for our justification;” * sometimes adding, that the sign is divinely appointed, † which, indeed, is implied in the other expression: “appointed for our justification.” And the Council of Trent goes so far as to anathematize everyone who denies that all the seven reputed Sacraments of the Church of Rome were instituted by Christ Himself. ‡

But warned by the mischiefs which the Roman doctrine of the Sacraments had caused, and perceiving the errors involved therein, our Church has wisely drawn her line more closely; receiving for Sacraments those two only which were ordained by Christ Himself while He sojourned upon earth, and disallowing the personal necessity of other reputed Sacraments to the salvation of a Christian man. And she declares, in her twenty-fifth Article of Religion, that “those five, commonly reputed Sacraments” (by the Roman Church), “that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel; being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not the like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.”

The words of the Homily § on this point are very deserving of our attention. “As for the number of the Sacraments, if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, namely, for the visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sins, and of our holiness and joining in Christ; there be but two, namely, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. For although Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin, yet, by the express word of the New Testament, it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign—I mean laying on of hands—is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are: and therefore Absolution is no such Sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are. And though the Ordering of Ministers hath

* Catechismus Conc. Trid., part ii., ch. i., sect. 5.

† Ibid. sect. 10.

‡ Sess. 7, Can. 1.

§ Homily of Com. Prayer and Sacraments.

this⁹ visible sign and promise, yet it lacks the promise of remission of sin, as all other Sacraments besides the two above-named do. Therefore neither it nor any other Sacrament else, be such Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are. But in a general acceptation, the name of a Sacrament may be attributed to anything, whereby an holy thing is signified.* In which understanding of the word the ancient writers have given this name, not only to the other five, commonly of late years taken and used for supplying the number of the Seven Sacraments, but also to divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil, washing of feet, and such like: not meaning thereby to repute them as Sacraments, in the same signification that the two forenamed Sacraments are. And, therefore, St. Augustine, weighing the true signification and the exact meaning of the word, writing to Januarius, and also in the Third Book of 'Christian Doctrine,' affirmeth, that the Sacraments of the Christians, as they are most excellent in signification, so are they most few in number;¹⁰ and in both places maketh mention expressly of two, the Sacrament of Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. And, although there are retained by the order of the Church of England, besides these two, certain other rites and ceremonies about the Institution of Ministers in the Church, Matrimony, Confirmation of Children, by examining them of their knowledge in the Articles of the Faith, and joining thereto the prayers of the Church for them, and likewise for the Visitation of the Sick; yet no man ought to take these for Sacraments in such signification and meaning as the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are; but either for godly states of life, necessary in Christ's Church, and therefore worthy to be set forth by public action and solemnity, by the ministry of the Church, or else judged to be such ordinances as may make for the instruction, comfort, and edification of Christ's Church."

But if the Church of Rome has multiplied the number of the Sacraments, there is a small, but by no means obscure, body of religionists, which takes away the Sacraments altogether: for, like the Ascodrutæ¹¹ in ancient times, the Quakers † also

⁹ "This visible sign" of "laying-on of hands," just before mentioned.

* See Appendix F.

¹⁰ "Sacramentis quidem paucissimis:—quædam pauca pro multis; sicuti est Baptismi sacramentum, et celebratio corporis et sanguinis Domini."—Ep. 54 ad Lib. III. ix.

† See Appendix G.

¹¹ "The Ascodrutæ, who were a sort of Gnostics, placed all religion in knowledge; and under pretence of spiritual worship, would admit of no external or corporeal sym-

deny that there are any signs under the Gospel. To enter at length into an examination of this question, would be beside our purpose; and, therefore, I shall refer the student to Leslie's "Discourse on Water Baptism," for a clear and satisfactory refutation of this tenet of the Quakers, and for a vindication of the Sacraments which Christ has ordained in his Church.

Having, however, referred to this strange tenet of the Quakers, it may be well for me to give some brief specimen of the arguments by which they endeavour to support it; more especially because the spirit of these arguments has much more extensive influence than at first sight appears: and it will be well also to suggest a summary proof, that our Lord Jesus Christ did institute outward signs¹²—water in baptism, and bread and wine in his holy Supper, as of perpetual obligation—till his coming again to judgment.

"They say, that all figures and signs are shadows, and that when Christ, who is the substance, is come, the others cease of course."* But a very simple person might answer, that there may be a shadow behind as well as before a thing, according as the light shines upon it; and that it by no means follows, that because the types of the law, which were "a shadow of good things to come,"† were abolished by their fulfilment, no sign can be admitted to prove that those good things are come. A person waking out of sleep can tell whether it is morning or evening, whether the sun has passed his meridian, by the direction of a shadow, as it may point westward or eastward: and so, as the types of the law prefigured a Saviour to come, the Sacraments of the Gospel demonstrate a Saviour who has come, and is yet once more to come again.¹³

bols whatsoever." They pretended "that faith and knowledge and spiritual worship were the only things that were required of Christians."—Bingham, XI. ii. 1, and XV. ii. 9.

So the Simonians and Menandrians, who disbelieved the Incarnation, rejected the Eucharist, because it necessarily assumes, and evidently sets forth, that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh."

¹² "Respect the time of their institution, and it thereby appeareth, that God hath annexed them for ever unto the New Testament, as other rites were before with the Old,"—Hooker, Eccl. Polity, v. 57.

"Theodoret speaks of some Christians who were called *Euo-hitæ*, because they were for prayer without sacraments; and of some who conceived so highly of the *spiritual* nature of Christianity, that they would allow of *no matter* or element whatsoever."—Hey's Lectures, Camb. 1841, ii. 454.

* Leslie on Water Baptism, sect. 11. Works, Lond. 1721, vol. ii. p. 702.

† Heb. x. 1, and Col. ii. 17.

¹³ "Sacramenta Novi Testamenti dant salutem, sacramenta Veteris Testamenti promiserunt Salvatorem."—August. in Ps. lxxiii.

"The Sacraments of the New Testament give salvation, the Sacraments of the Old Testament promised the Saviour."

"Illa (sacramenta legis) fuerunt pro-

"The Sacraments of the law were pro-

But the Saviour, they say, is come, and abides with us. Now, as He came in the flesh, He is also in the flesh gone away up into heaven, "where He ever sits on the right-hand of God, till his enemies be made his footstool,"* returning no more in the flesh until the last and great day. Yet when the Lord Jesus was actually dwelling in the flesh upon earth, when the substance was come, and the true light and Sun of righteousness was present and shining upon the world, so far was He from doing away with all signs and shadows, that He received his disciples by baptism with water, † and enjoined the same mode of making disciples amongst "all nations, always, even unto the end of the world." ‡

Again: they plead that it is the spiritual coming and indwelling of Christ which they mean. But Christ was spiritually present with the Israelites in the desert, for St. Paul tells us that they "did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them; and that rock was Christ." § And if the spiritual presence must, as a matter of course, abolish all signs, then were the types and shadows of the law of as little obligation before the coming of Christ in the flesh, as they would make the Sacraments of the Gospel to be.

They also allege the words of our Saviour to the woman of Samaria: "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth:" || and they argue thus:—"The new worship which was thus to distinguish Christianity, was to be *in spirit*, because it was to consist, not in outward rites of a formal and ceremonial nature, but in services dictated by the spirit of the Lord, and in direct communion of the soul with its Creator. It was to be in truth; not simply as arising out of a sincere heart—a description which might apply with equal force to the abolished worship of the Jews—but because it was to consist in substantial realities. It was to be carried on, not through the old medium of types and figures, but by the application to the heart of the great and essential truths of the Gospel dispensa-

missiones rerum complendarum; hæc sunt indicia completarum."—Id. Cont. Faust. XIX. xiv.

mises of things to be fulfilled; these [the Sacraments of the New Testament] are marks of things that have been fulfilled."

* John xvi. 28; Heb. x. 12, 13; Acts iii. 21.

† John iv. 1, 2, and iii. 26, 23.

‡ Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

§ 1 Cor. x. 3, 4.

|| John iv. 23, 24.

tion ; for the type was now to be exchanged for the antitype ; the figure for the thing figured ; the shadow for the substance.”*

Now it is at once evident that this argument, if it can be called an argument, is, in reality, no better than an attempt to prove a thing merely by supposing that it is proved. But it is not the same thing to say, that we must worship the Father in spirit, and to say that we must worship Him in spirit *only*, as this argument implies ; or else it would hold good that the outward ordinances and rites of the law forbade, and excluded spiritual worship, just as much as that the spiritual worship required of Christians excludes all outward forms and signs. And if we were to understand that we must worship in spirit only, exclusive of forms, as the Quaker argument requires, then it is plain, that not the Sacraments only, but the reverence and worship of the body, and the utterance of any of our devotions in words must be excluded also ; for one is as much a form and sign as the other. Whereas, since God made the body as well as the spirit of man, He is entitled to the worship of both ; or else we rob Him of the honour due unto his name. And so the apostle tells us, that we are to glorify God in our bodies and in our spirits, for they are both his.† So far, we may observe by the way, from being acceptable to the Father, is the worship of those who, in their unconcern, self-indulgence, or self-will, sit at their ease in public prayer, flattering themselves all the while that they are worshipping God in their hearts, but withholding from Him the worship and humble reverence of that body, which is as much the work of his hands as the soul, and which, no less than the soul, has been redeemed by the precious blood of Christ. No worship is spiritual but that which is real and true ; and no worship is real and true unless it be that of the whole man, of body as well as of soul, where that worship can be given.¹⁴

I have alluded to the reception of disciples in baptism with water by our Blessed Lord,‡ and his injunction to the apostles before He went up into heaven, to make disciples of all nations

* Gurney on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends, p. 63, 2nd ed. 8vo, 1824.

† 1 Cor. vi. 20.

¹⁴ Our Lord's actions must be taken as the best interpreter of his words. He most undeniably worshipped in spirit and in truth ; and He worshipped with the body as well as with the soul. He even fell down upon his face in his prayers. So the Apostles, in conformity with the true sense of his instructions and with his practice, knelt down in prayer, sometimes even on the sea-shore, where kneeling must have been somewhat inconsistent with bodily ease.

‡ See Appendix H.

and to baptize them, must be taken in the same way, as intending a baptism also with water. For as He had accustomed them to baptize with water, they could only understand Him, as we find from their practice that they did understand Him, when He commissioned them to baptize all nations, as enjoining the same rite; though it may have been for the first time that He then added, that they were to baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The Quakers allege, indeed, that the commission to baptize was not with water, but with the Holy Ghost, inasmuch as our Saviour did not expressly make mention of water:* but having been accustomed, as I have said, to baptize with water, by his authority and in his presence, for the admission of disciples into their company, they needed no mention of water in the case; for they would unavoidably understand that water was intended.¹⁵ If anything else was intended, it was plainly necessary that it should be expressed. Nor can it be maintained that our Lord intended they should understand Him as sending them to baptize with the Holy Ghost: for this baptism was peculiar to Himself; as it was revealed from heaven to the Baptist: “upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.” † For though we look in baptism for baptism by the Holy Ghost, yet this is altogether his own peculiar gift, according to his promise: “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” ‡

Having thus, as I would hope, disproved the dogma, that there are no signs under the Gospel, and having shown the perpetual obligation of baptism with water, we need only, at present, refer to the relation made by the Evangelists, of the institution of the Lord’s Supper, to the practice of the Church while under the immediate government of the apostles, and to the special revelation by the Lord Himself to St. Paul, as related in the eleventh chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians,—for proof of the perpetual obligation of the Eucharist.

* Appendix I.

¹⁵ “Manichæi lavacrum regenerationis, id est, aquam ipsam dicunt esse superfluum, nec prodesse aliquid profano corde contendunt.—Manichæi visibile destrunt elementum.”—August. contra Epp. Pelagianorum, ed. Migne, x. 573, II. ii.

“The Manichæans say that the laver of regeneration, that is, the water itself, is superfluous, and with profane heart contend that it profits nothing.—The Manichæans destroy the visible element.”

Is there not a very considerable likeness to these Manichæan tenets in some religious systems of the nineteenth century? Regarding too much the weakness of the creature, they forget the power and ordinance of the Redeemer.

† John i. 33.

‡ Matt. xxviii. 20.

The Sacraments are declared by the Church of England to be “generally necessary to salvation;” that is, as the office for the Public Baptism of “such as are of riper years,” expresses it, necessary, “where they may be had.”¹⁶

For, as our Lord Jesus Christ said: “Except one be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God:” so has He also said: “Except ye eat the flesh* of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” For whether He used these words directly of his holy Supper, or not, yet as He has appointed it to be the special means of receiving that of which He did assuredly speak,—of partaking of his body and his blood,—it is plain, that if any one neglect the means,† he cannot hope to attain the object for which it was appointed; and he is wanting in that faith, without which the participation of his body and blood is impossible. When our Saviour said on the night that He was betrayed: “This is my body—This is my blood;” He answered the question¹⁷ formerly put by the Jews: “How can this man give us his flesh to eat?” He, in effect, said: “It is by eating this bread and drinking this cup, in remembrance of me,—as the grateful memorial of my sacrifice for the life of the world,—that you are to do that of which I spake to the Jews, when I said: ‘Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood,’—except ye feast upon and partake of the sacrifice of my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world,—‘ye have no life in you.’” And so St. Paul, according to the revelation to him of the Lord Himself, says: “the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?” This is the way in which the true believer,—he who has faith to eat spiritually,—is instructed that he is to do it.‡

¹⁶ And with this limitation, necessary to all men; not as matrimony is advisable or expedient for some, and Orders are necessary for those who are to minister in the Church.

The words “generally necessary to salvation” are, no doubt, intended as a distinction of the proper Sacraments from those other rites called Sacraments, which are not necessary to the salvation of those who receive them; not necessary to the salvation of man in general. All men do not need Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, or Extreme Unction, even if they were Sacraments. Some of them cannot be received by all men; for none of them are necessary to infants. Whereas Baptism is necessary to all of every age, and the Eucharist to all who are of fit age to receive it.

* Appendix K.

† Appendix L.

¹⁷ I find that Bishop Van Mildert has the same thought. See his *Life of Waterland*, 1823, p. 278.

‡ See Appendix M.

CHAPTER III.

THE OUTWARD PART OR SIGN.

HAVING shown that our Lord Jesus Christ has ordained the Sacrament of his Holy Supper, as of perpetual obligation in his Church, and that it is generally necessary to salvation; we have next to show that it is “bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received,” as “the outward part or sign” of this Sacrament.

From the conjoint testimony of the Evangelists and of St. Paul, the facts of the institution are these: “Jesus took the bread (Mat. Gr.), and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body,* which is broken,” † or, “given for you; this do in remembrance of me;” ‡ and “after the same manner also He took the cup,” § filled with “the fruit of the vine,” || “and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: ¶ For this is my blood of the New Testament,” ** or, “this cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you,” †† and “for many, for the remission of sins: ‡‡ this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.” §§

In the institution of the Lord’s Supper, then, bread and wine, and only bread and wine, were used: and as the apostles had received it, so also they taught and practised; as we may find from St. Paul’s words to the Corinthians, where he tells them that “as often as they did eat this bread, and drink this cup, they did shew forth the Lord’s death till He come.” ||| And throughout the universal Church, bread and wine have ever been the recognised elements or signs in this Sacrament.

Nothing but what our Lord used in the institution; nothing but what He took, blessed, and brake, and gave, has ever been allowed in the Church for the matter or elements of the Eucharist. He did not say, “Do this,” in reference to anything whatever, but to bread and wine. Nor has He left the trace

* Matt. xxvi. 26.

† 1 Cor. xi. 24.

‡ Luke xxii. 19.

§ 1 Cor. xi. 25.

|| Matt. xxvi. 29.

¶ Ibid. v. 27.

** Ibid. v. 28.

†† Luke xxii. 20.

‡‡ Matt. xxvi. 28.

§§ 1 Cor. xi. 25.

|| Ibid. v. 26.

of any principle, upon which any other substances might be adopted. They, therefore, who under any circumstances take any other things than bread and wine for the elements in this Sacrament, follow only their own wisdom and devices, not his will.

Questions have been raised as to the fitness of the ordained elements; and Aquinas discusses the suggestion, that "the flesh of such animals as were the matter of the sacraments of the old law, more expressly represent the passion of Christ than bread and wine;"¹⁸ but he rejects the suggestion, for the unanswerable reason, that it was bread and wine in which our Lord instituted the Sacrament. That, unquestionably, which He used must be the fittest; that which He used, He *ipso facto* ordained; for that which He did not use, there can be no warrant; and, therefore, that which He used must be necessary.

Some schismatics of old used cheese with the bread of the Eucharist; and were therefore called Arto-tyritæ, or -turitæ: but they were justly condemned as heretics for their wilful and profane innovation.

Bread, then, being one of the necessary elements of the Eucharist, it has been debated of what material the bread should be made, how it should be made, and of what size and shape it should be made. Coarse wheaten meal, barley, oats, rye, peas, beans, spelt, millet, cummin, chestnuts, dates, potatoes, and even wood, are all materials from which, as well as from pure flour of wheat, an article is produced, which people call by the name of bread. It is therefore necessary to distinguish by the name of the material from which it is made, what kind of bread is to be used: for it is evident, that if anything which, properly or improperly, may be called bread, may be taken for the Eucharist, there would be endless diversity of practice; and the Sacrament, instead of being a bond of union, would be fruitful of disunion. Nor can it be imagined that our Lord intended

¹⁸ 3a q. 74, art. 1. Bingham, XV. ii. 3, notices from Walafrid Strabo a practice in the Roman Church of consecrating a lamb with a peculiar benediction, on Good Friday, of which they partook on Easter day. Strabo "severely censured" the practice, but Ratramn and Æneas Parisiensis defended it. It would seem, however, from an account and representation in a number of the Illustrated London News (April 16, 1870), that it still continues. The writer says that "two paschal lambs to be killed at Easter for the Pope's table are blessed on St. Agnes' day, Jan. 21, in the Church of St. Agnes.—The animals are laid upon the altar. After the celebration of High Mass, they were sprinkled with holy water, and a formal sentence of benediction was pronounced over them. The wool of these lambs is carefully preserved, spun into yarn by the nuns of St. Agnes, and woven into cloth for the sacred pallium."

that these several kinds of bread might be used indifferently. But his intention must be learned, as it is most certainly and sufficiently to be learned, from his action. It was but one particular kind of bread which He took, one loaf of bread made from the flour, the fine sifted flour of wheat; for that is the only kind of flour which we read to have been used in the religious rites of the Jews. The bread which He used at the Passover, and consequently for the Eucharist, was made from wheat, from the finest wheat flour, not from the coarse unsifted meal. This, therefore, is the only kind of bread, for the use of which in the Eucharist we have any warrant or authority. It is of no use to suggest that which He did not use. The only authority is for that which He did use.

Various other reasons may confirm this conclusion, as, for instance, the excellence of such bread, representing the heavenly food; while barley bread would represent the bondage and hardships of Egypt, or as Aquinas, after Augustine, thought, "the hardness of the old law, and not the sweet yoke of Christ, the manifestation of His truth, and His spiritual people."

Then the question follows, how this bread is to be made. That the bread, indeed, which our Lord used, was unleavened, cannot, with sufficient reason, be denied. He was celebrating the Passover, in which, and during its whole solemnities, leavened bread was most strictly forbidden. Nor does it at all affect this question, whether He anticipated the day, or kept to the precise day appointed by the law and observed by the Jews: for if He kept the Passover, as we know He did, it cannot be supposed but that He kept it with all its due and prescribed rites; and, therefore, that He used for his supper in this feast, not such bread as was ordinarily used at other times, but unleavened bread, as the law prescribed.

From this it follows, that the use of unleavened bread by any Church cannot be condemned on any Scriptural grounds.

But the real question is, is it necessary that the bread of the Eucharist should be unleavened? And a sufficient answer may be obtained to this question by a careful consideration of the language of Scripture. St. Matthew, certainly, tells us in the Greek, that "Jesus took the bread," the unleavened bread which formed part of the previous feast, the only bread which might then be eaten. But St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, all say

that He "took bread," omitting the definite article; abstaining thus from hinting to Gentile readers and hearers, any distinction between leavened and unleavened bread; and leaving it to be supposed that ordinary bread¹⁹ was sufficient to be understood: whereas, if unleavened bread were requisite, they would surely have been careful to intimate this. Then, if, as some have thought, our Lord celebrated the Sacrament at Emmaus, it is said that He "took the bread," the bread, namely, which had been set before the party for their repast. It was, indeed, within the days of unleavened bread, and, therefore, the bread which He took was such. But He took the bread, evidently, as that which was usually employed for common meals. Again, if we read the passage in the second chapter of the Acts, "breaking bread in the house," as I think with many that we ought; and if we interpret it of the Eucharist, as some have done, we find that "bread" is here indefinite, and must admit that the kind used was most probably leavened, since it was not in time of the Passover. And, lastly, in the notice of the celebration of the Eucharist at Troas, it is said that "the disciples came together to break bread," without anything to intimate a distinction between leavened and unleavened bread: and, indeed, from the statement in the verse before, that it was "after the days of unleavened bread" we might conclude, that the bread in this case was such as was commonly used at the time, and therefore leavened. In short, it may be said, that there is a studious abstinence throughout from every form of expression which could suggest, that the kind of bread intended to be used, or actually used, was any other than that which was in common use at the time. There is absolutely nothing to lead Gentile Christians to suppose that azymes, or unleavened bread, must be used for the Sacrament.

Amongst Jewish Christians, at the time of the Passover, it would very likely be unleavened bread which they would have for the Eucharist, since they were "all zealous of the law:" but at other times, they would hardly consider themselves bound in this particular, when the law did not prescribe unleavened bread for their ordinary food. Amongst Gentile Christians there would be nothing to bind them, but the common practice which they had learned, and which would naturally be not more strict than that of their Jewish brethren, excepting where the rulers

¹⁹ Ordinary bread is always meant by bread without the definite article. Barley bread is always distinguished by its own name: Jud. vii. 13; 2 Kings iv. 42; John vi. 9, 13. Fermentum was a very usual name for the Sacramental bread. See Bingham XV. ii. 5.

of the Church might consider it necessary to resist the imposition of ceremonies of the law.

The practice of the Church over all the world was conformable to this view. In the Eastern Church, so tenacious of ancient forms, leavened bread, such wheaten bread as was in common use, has been, with a certain qualification, always and universally taken for consecration, excepting, as I think is said, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Such, at least, the practice and doctrine of the Greek Church would seem to prove. It was the same in the Western Church for many centuries. Pope Alexander I., it is true, ordered that "the oblation should be made of unfermented, and not of fermented, bread, as before:"* but his order does not seem to have been much regarded; for it is stated, with the testimonies of many learned men of the Roman Church, that "the use of wafers or unleavened bread was not known in the Church till the eleventh or twelfth century:" † that is, I suppose, the compulsory or general use. It then became a subject of fierce controversy between writers of the Eastern and Western Churches; the former insisting upon leavened, the latter upon unleavened bread.

The practice of the Church was, in fact, for a long time determined by the oblations of the people, out of which the elements for the Holy Communion were taken: but when the oblations began to cease, and the bread was to be made for this particular purpose, and to be provided by the clergy themselves, the private opinions of these gradually changed the practice: for they, "under pretence of decency and respect, brought it from leaven to unleaven, and from a loaf of common bread, that might be broken, to a nice and delicate wafer, formed in the figure of a *denarius* or penny, to represent the pence (as some authors about that time will have it) for which our Saviour was betrayed:" ‡ a very inappropriate notion, it must be allowed.

The rule of the Roman Church, however, which requires unleavened bread, is sufficiently fair and reasonable. It is held that "whether the bread be leavened or unleavened is a circumstance of pure discipline, which does not touch the essence of the Eucharist." § And in the Roman Missal the priest is instructed, that "if the bread be not unleavened, according to the custom of the Latin Church, the consecration is valid, but the priest greatly sins:"²⁰ that is, a priest in that Church: for

* Platina, De Vitis Pontiff.

† Bingham XV. ii. 5.

‡ Bingham, XV. ii. 5.

§ Rock's Hierurgia, Lond. 1851, II. ii. xv. 206.

²⁰ "Si non sit azymus, secundum morem Ecclesie Latine, conficitur, sed conficiens graviter peccat."—De Defectibus, iii.

though she requires the bread to be unleavened, and declares any of her priests who should consecrate otherwise, without necessity, to be guilty of sin, it is as transgressors of her common order, and not as doing that which in itself is unlawful: and it is held to be equally the duty of priests in the Greek Church to use leavened bread, and that they likewise would be guilty of sin if they should use unleavened.

It is justly said, that whether leavened or unleavened, each kind "has the true and proper nature and name of bread," and that "Christ required usual bread, that which is properly called bread."²¹ Therefore, wheaten flour mixed with water, that is, in the condition of dough, or unbaked, or sodden, is clearly improper for the Sacrament. Such would not be called bread, and therefore ought not to be used for this purpose; though it is possible that some might deem that their use would be justifiable under circumstances, and that it would be hard and over-scrupulous to object to it.

The use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist is most unquestionably and clearly sanctioned by the fact, that it was such bread which our Lord Himself gave, and it is advocated by the mystic plea, that it represents or indicates the assumption of our flesh by Him without confusion of substance; while it is admitted both that the use of unfermented bread in other Churches is sanctioned by a like plea, namely, that it represents the Word of the Father clothed in flesh, true God and true man; and also, that whether the bread which we break be leavened or unleavened, we are equally made the living body of the Lord our Saviour.²²

²¹ Dens, v. 268. "Christus requirit panem usulem et proprie dictum."—De Euch. 13. "Neque tamen ea qualitas adeo necessaria existimanda est, ut si illa pani desit, sacramentum confici non potest: utrumque enim panis genus verum et proprium panis rationem et nomen habet."—Cat. Conc. Trid. II. xv.

²² "De usu fermentati et azymi panis in Cœna sic scripsit Gregorius in Registro: Romana ecclesia offert azymos panes, propterea quod Dominus sine ulla commistione suscepit carnem. Aliæ vero ecclesiæ fermentatum offerunt, pro eo quod Verbum Patris indutum est carne, et est verus Deus et verus homo. Nam et fermentum commiscetur farina: sed tamen tam azymum quam fermentatum dum sumimus, vivum corpus Domini Servatoris efficitur."—Hospinian. I. 191.

"On the use of fermented and unfermented bread in the Supper Gregory in his Register [of Epistles] wrote thus: The Roman Church offers unleavened bread, because that the Lord took flesh without any commixture. But other Churches offer fermented, for the reason that the Word of the Father was clothed in flesh, and is true God and true man. For the leaven also is mixed with the flour; but yet while we take unfermented or fermented, we are made the living body of the Lord our Saviour."

The use, then, of leavened or unleavened bread being acknowledged to be a matter of indifference, it is clearly within the authority of the Church, either Catholic or national, to determine, if it be necessary or expedient to determine, which of the two kinds should be taken. In the exercise of this inalienable privilege, the Church of England, in order "to take away all occasion of dissension or superstition, which any person hath or might have concerning the bread and wine," has determined, that "it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten." She has thus left it to be determined in any particular place or country under her ministry, whether leavened or unleavened bread is to be used in the Sacrament. And it is evident that the introduction of anything as an ingredient into the bread, which would make it different from "such as is usual to be eaten," is inconsistent with the rule here laid down.

But before dismissing this part of my subject, I must be allowed to make some remarks on a recent decision of the Court of Arches. The question was, whether wafer bread is lawful in the Church of England, and whether, in the administration of the Sacrament, a whole wafer or a part should be given into the hands of each communicant. It was decided that there was "no evidence that the wafer was not broken." But the very able and learned judge was, if I may venture to say it, clearly mistaken in two points; the first, in assuming unleavened bread and wafers to be the same; and the second, in deciding from the Rubric that unleavened bread is lawful in the province of Canterbury.

Wafer bread is, indeed, a self-contradictory term, unless it mean loaves of such kind of bread as may be made into wafers. But if it be in wafers, it is not properly called bread. To call wafers, therefore, wafer bread, is an oversight. Wafers are certainly unleavened: but unleavened bread may be made up in many other ways than in wafers. I have seen it made up into large square thick pieces, for use in a Presbyterian meeting-house. It is, therefore, not by any means a necessary conclusion, that if unleavened bread be lawful, unleavened wafers are lawful. They are not synonymous.

But it is a very obvious mistake to pronounce that the use of unleavened bread is lawful everywhere in this province of Canterbury; for this, in effect, is the decision pronounced.

The Rubric of our present Prayer Book, which, as the latest law of the Church, must override all previous Rubrics, says: "It shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten." This cannot mean that other kinds of bread, however unusual to be eaten, may be used. It can refer only to "the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten;" and must mean that the decision whether it is to be leavened or unleavened in any particular case, is to be taken from the common custom in meals.²³ If it be usual in any place for the people to eat unleavened bread, then unleavened bread is to be taken for consecration: but if the people of the place usually eat leavened bread in their meals, then this is the kind to be used in the Sacrament. Such is the clear and necessary meaning of the Rubric.

Now it is notorious, that the bread which is usual to be eaten in this province of Canterbury, and in the place where the defendant exercised his ministry, is leavened, and is not unleavened, bread. Leavened bread, therefore, is that which the law of the Church requires in that province; and unleavened bread is inconsistent with that law.

Again, in the spirit of St. Paul's words: "Because it is one bread (loaf), we being many are one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread;"* the Church of England requires bread in the same sense, bread that can be broken into "divers pieces:" and her mind unquestionably is, that it should not be wafers so small that they cannot be broken, or can only be broken into so very few pieces that they cannot symbolise the "many" members of the one body of Christ.

The conclusion is, that the lawfulness in any place under the Church of England, of unleavened bread as one of the elements of the Eucharist, does not amount to a sanction of wafers; and that unleavened bread is not lawful, where "such bread" is not "usually eaten."

With regard to the size of the bread, reason requires that there should be enough for the number of communicants, whether in one or in several loaves, or suitable parts of loaves: and one of the mystic significations of the Sacrament taught us in Holy Scripture, requires that it should be of such a size that it can be broken into "many" pieces, or at least as many

²³ The Second Book of Edward VI. and the Prayer Book of Elizabeth have, "such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meats."

* 1 Cor. x. 17.

as there are to communicate. Small thin wafers, therefore, which cannot be so broken, cannot rightly be used; and so, I take it, the Dean of Arches intimated, when he said: "There is no evidence that the wafer was not broken." The First Prayer Book of Edward VI., which some desire to have reinstated in use, directs that the bread should be "something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces."

The shape one would think a matter of indifference. But authorities in the Church of Rome have it that it is to be "orbicular." Orbicular means globular,* but use and Dr. Rock say: "It is made thin and circular, and bears upon it either the figure of Christ, or those initials, I.H.S."† In the use of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom in the Greek Church, Dr. Covel describes the bread thus: "In the middle of the loaf on the upper side is imprinted in a square a plain cross, with IC. XC. NI. KA. in the four corners between the sides of the long square, and the respective lines of the cross. These letters stand for *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς νικᾷ* (*Jesus Christ overcometh*)."‡ The First Book of Edward VI. directs, "that the bread prepared for the Communion be made through all this realm, after one sort and fashion: that is to say, unleavened, and round, as it was afore, but without all manner of print, and something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces." But the present Rubric, which requires "such bread as is usual to be eaten," supersedes the necessity of all such directions. Wafers are not usual to be eaten anywhere.

The use of wafers is a purely Romish practice; and having been introduced only in the eleventh or twelfth century, and that against the reclamations of various authors of weight;§ while unleavened bread is unused by the Eastern Church; it is, most evidently and unquestionably, not Catholic.

One expression, however, in the Rubric remains to be noticed. "To take away all occasion of dissension and superstition," it says, "which any person hath or might have concerning the Bread and Wine, it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usual to be eaten; but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten." And from the words, "it shall suffice," it is argued that the Rubric only limits

* See Bingham, XV. ii. 6.

† Hierurgia, II. i. 17, p. 206.

‡ Account of the Greek Church, Cambridge, 1722, p. 29.

§ See Bingham, XV. ii. 6.

the *minimum*, so to speak, of what is required as to the bread, but leaves a liberty, as to kind and size of the bread: that is, provided it be "the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten," it may be leavened or unleavened, it may be in loaves or in wafers, and in any size or shape we may please. But this interpretation of the words, "it shall suffice," is not supported by any other places in the Book of Common Prayer which I can find. In the office for the Public Baptism of Infants, we read that "if they certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it;" which is, surely, a prohibition to dip the child in the water, with the assurance that such a way is a sufficient administration of the Sacrament. It does not leave the minister at liberty to dip the child, notwithstanding the certification that it is weak. At the end of the office for the Baptism of such as are of Riper Years, the Rubric directs that "if any persons, not baptized in their infancy, shall be brought to be baptized before they come to years of discretion to answer for themselves, it may suffice to use the office for Public Baptism of Infants, or (in case of extreme danger) the Office for Private Baptism:" and this, surely, does not leave the minister at liberty, if he please, to use the office for the Baptism of such as be of Riper Years in such a case, or any form of his own devising or choice; but confines him to the office for Public Baptism of Infants, or to the office for Private Baptism, "in case of extreme danger." So, again, in the Rubric after "the Ordering of Priests," we read that "if on the same day the Order of Deacons be given to some, and the Order of Priesthood to others, the Deacons shall be first presented, and then the Priests, and it shall suffice that the Litany be once said for both;" where it cannot be contended that any liberty is left to say the Litany in the Ordering of the Deacons, and again in the Ordering of the Priests.

Nor is it allowable to construe the terms of any Rubric inconsistently with its expressed intention. This Rubric was put forth "to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition which any person hath or might have concerning the Bread and Wine:" but such an intention would be defeated, if, rejecting such bread as is usual to be eaten "in the place," the curate shall choose such bread as is not "usual to be eaten" there, whether leavened or unleavened; if, instead of a loaf, he have wafers; if he please his own fancy, or follow what he may suppose to be a "Catholic" practice, in the composition, size,

shape, or imprinting of the bread. He would give "occasion of dissension and superstition" instead of taking it away.

The other element of the Eucharist has always, and everywhere in the Church, been determined to be Wine, of the fruit of the vine: because it was wine, of the fruit of the vine, which was used by our Lord in the institution. This only, with the bread, is He related to have taken, and blessed, and given. This only, therefore, is his Church, and all her ministers, to take, and bless, and give.

Some indeed, anciently, used water; and were from this called *Hydroparastatæ*, or *Aquarii*; some used milk, or honey mixed with water; and some, grapes whole or macerated: but they were all condemned as heretics; and this justly and necessarily. For if any will not adhere to, and do, that which our Lord did, and told his disciples to do, he is not a follower of Him, but is led by his own wisdom and devices. It is a very grave error, which no circumstances can justify, to change the ordinance of Christ.

Yet a spirit of unconscious rationalism, to which some minds are subject, has not seldom suggested that, under the pressure of necessity, other liquids may be used, and therefore ought to be used, instead of wine. Calvin, for instance, argued that our Lord's "design in instituting this Sacrament, was to represent to us, under the symbols of common food and drink, the communion of spiritual nourishment, that is of Himself; and, therefore, if there had not then been a common use of wine in Judæa, He would beyond all doubt have used another common drink, as is clear from His purpose and design. Consequently that they do not seem to do anything foreign to the design and will of Christ, who, not from contempt or rashness, but driven by very necessity, used instead of wine some other kind of drink usual in the regions" they were in. Beza, too, entirely approved of this notion of Calvin, recommending, under circumstances, some liquid analogous to wine. And Melancthon, in the same opinion, suggested honey and water, or mead. But it was somewhat too confident and bold of Calvin, to say "beyond all doubt," what our Lord would have done under circumstances which he supposed. It was essentially rationalistic to write in this way. And we have not in its perfection the wisdom and knowledge of Christ. How should we know what He would have done, at least so certainly as to act differently from what He did and said? It is not so necessary to celebrate an imitation of the Sacraments, as it is to keep the commandments of Christ.

But let it be considered that if once we allow ourselves to reason in this way, and thus embolden ourselves to take and bless and give such things as Christ our Lord did not take and bless and give; there would be absolute and endless confusion, if not profanity, in the celebration of this most sacred ordinance. The principle which would allow any other liquid to be taken for the Eucharist instead of wine, what varieties of practice might it not sanction in different regions, and under different circumstances! and even in the same region! for that which was lawful in one could hardly be held to be essentially unlawful in another. A high dignitary of the Church of England in one of our colonies, some years ago related, with much apparent satisfaction, that having come "purposely to administer the Holy Communion to a dying native," he looked round in vain for the means—there was no wine nor any bread; but that he took hard biscuit moistened with water for bread, and pure water for wine. But if there was any necessity here, it was apparently self-imposed; for one would think that a clergyman anywhere going purposely to administer the Holy Communion, would provide himself with the proper "means," if he were not sure of their being forthcoming in the place of the proposed ministrations.

Again, a clergyman many years ago told me, that once, having gone to administer the Communion to a sick parishioner, he had forgotten to take some wine with him; and as there was no wine in the house, and they could not conveniently obtain any, he bethought himself of beer, seeing no reason why it would not, under the circumstances, serve the purpose as well as wine. He therefore celebrated the Sacrament with beer. He was quite unconscious of any impropriety; and related the circumstance merely as an example of what he conceived ought to be done, and must be done, in such a case; regarding his proceeding as an exercise of wise discrimination and kind-heartedness.

I have also been informed, that the wife of a Presbyterian minister in Scotland once contrived a mixture of whisky, sugar, and water, with black-currant jelly; and that her husband, knowing what it was, sacramentally ministered it to his congregation.

Such instances serve to show the danger of judging for ourselves, where the Lord, by his own ordinance, has taken judgment out of our hands.

On the same principle on which water, or beer, was used, the other mixture was alike lawful and right; and as applied to the other element, if bread be wanting, that principle would

justify the use of any other eatable that is commonly used for food. It would convert the common food of the Esquimaux into a fitting element of the Lord's Supper.

The Catechism of the Church of England briefly but plainly teaches the right doctrine and practice. It says that bread and wine are the outward part or sign of this Sacrament; which is as much as to exclude everything else from being used in it. It was bread and wine which our Lord Jesus Christ took, and sanctified to be his body and blood; and He did not sanctify anything else to that purpose; therefore bread and wine, and nothing else, are the outward part or sign in the Sacrament. With bread and wine we have the Sacrament ordained by Christ: without bread and wine we have not the Sacrament ordained by Christ.

When, therefore, these elements of bread and wine are not to be had, the well-instructed Pastor will remember, that, though "God is never wanting to his Sacraments," his grace is not exclusively tied to them; that, while we may humbly but confidently trust to that mercy, which accepteth a man according to that which he hath, and not according to that which he hath not, no minister of Christ may substitute a thing of his own, or any other man's, device, instead of that which alone the Lord has ordained; and that when the Sacrament cannot be ministered according to the divine institution, the parishioner is to be instructed, "that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the Cross for him, and shed his blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving Him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth."*

It would seem almost superfluous, but it may yet be necessary to add, that neither the bread is to be consecrated without the wine, nor the wine without the bread; nor is one to be administered without the ministration of the other. In the former case, of the consecration of one kind, there would not be the Sacrament ordained by Christ; in the latter, of the administration of one kind only, the priest, notwithstanding the consecration of both kinds, not only administers a mutilated Sacrament, but defrauds the communicant of the true

* Rubric in the Communion of the Sick, Book of Common Prayer.

Sacrament which our Lord ordained, and to which only his grace is appropriated. But this is a question which has to be dealt with more at large in another place.

Two objections remain now to be noticed. The first is of this kind: there are countries in which no wheat is grown or no wine is made: but if bread of wheat and wine from the vine be necessary to this Sacrament, then it cannot be administered in such countries. And the conclusion intended would be, that some other things than bread and wine must be taken for the purpose. The answer is, that if any other things than those which were ordained by Christ be taken for the elements of the Eucharist, there would, in principle and practically, be no limit to men's choice; till the whole catalogue of the usual food and drink of all the nations of the earth were exhausted. The food of the Esquimaux, as has just now been said, would become a legitimate and necessary element of the Holy Communion in the countries where they live. But "known unto God are all his works from the beginning;" and it may most certainly be determined, that whatsoever He has ordained in his Church as necessary to salvation, He will provide for his Church in every part of the world to which her bounds may be extended.²⁴ Aquinas* rightly said, that wheat and wine sufficient for the Sacrament can be easily carried to lands which do not naturally produce them. Where Christ sends his ministers, He will assuredly send with or to them, all such things as are necessary to their ministry. But the objection is much more imaginary than practical; and it may be briefly met with the reply, that when the case should really arise, "God will provide."

The second objection is, that some persons may not be able to swallow the bread or drink the wine. And here again the answer is, that if any, really and truly, cannot receive the Sacrament as Christ has ordained it, then being thus hindered from Sacramental Communion, they not only are absolved by the necessity of their case, but may humbly and confidently trust, that they are partakers of the body and blood of the Lord, by spiritual communion with Him.

But here we have to meet the case of some in these days, who not only think that the use of wine, such as we usually call by

²⁴ "Isolated and distant churches of Christ need never lack them, having fellowship with all Christendom, as the Moravian missions in Greenland show."—Stier, Words of the Lord Jesus, vii. 120.

* 3a. q. 74, art. i. 20.

the name, in the Eucharist is not necessary but denounce it as absolutely sinful. Societies under various names, as Temperance and Total Abstinence Societies, and others, have sprung up in this generation, whose principle, in naked truth, seems to be, that vice is to be extinguished only by the total disregard or suppression of its correlative virtue. They do not seem to remember, that everyone who calls himself, and is in profession, a Christian, is a member of a Society of total abstinence from sin of whatever kind; that he is bound by the most solemn obligations to abstain from drunkenness and all other vices; and above all, that he has the promise of Almighty grace, if he will seek it and use it, to help him to fulfil all these obligations. He is under this obligation to God, and to all his fellow-Christians. But if he disregard this obligation, and yet bind himself by, and keep, another pledge of abstinence from one vice by a pledge to men, it seems like "daubing a wall with untempered mortar."

It may be said, indeed, that it is surely better for a man, even out of a bare regard to his fellow-men and by virtue of a pledge to them, to cut off the sin of drunkenness by the roots, by totally abstaining himself from all use of the means by which it is wrought by others. And the answer would be, "Certainly," if that be all. But it very often happens, and it is to be feared very commonly, that this is not all: for if we may take lecturers of such Societies for a fair example, the reports of their speeches exhibit, not the humility of Christian temperance, but the pride of total and worldly abstinence. They give vivid pictures of themselves in their unconverted state, of their brutal, reckless habits, of the wretchedness of their families, and of the low esteem in which they were held: but now, they are patterns of all that is comfortable and well to do; they are greeted with respect; and are creditable and highly respected members of society. Great worldly advantages, certainly: but what as to the state of the soul before God, if there be a pride in these things, and a leaning to an arm of flesh? Truly, if a man cannot taste without following on to drunkenness, he had infinitely better not taste at all, than indulge to his ruin. But with regard to others who are temperate, it seems no more reasonable, no more a Christian duty, for them to practise total abstinence for the purpose of reclaiming drunkards, than for the chaste to abstain from marriage, in order to reclaim the whoremonger and the partakers of his sin.

Justly indeed, do these Societies declaim against drunkenness

as the parent of innumerable ills, as the ruin of body and soul; and Christian efforts to check this vice, and if possible to extinguish it, are worthy of all praise. But it does not seem rational or Christian-like, to cry down temperance, in order to check intemperance, to put down vice by putting down its opposite virtue. Yet these Societies declaim against temperance even as a sin, and the parent of drunkenness. "Temperate habitual drinkers" [of beer, wine, &c.], they have said, "are the real authors of inebriety." They allege even that the use of wine in the Holy Communion is a principal cause of drunkenness. "The Church," say they, "is to save the world. But how can she do this while leagued with murderers? How, while she harbours in her bosom instruments of destruction? She must [abandon wine in the Sacrament] to retain the Holy Spirit. If the Church in her communion and ordinances would break from all use of the alcoholic poison, there would be hope for this dying world." They demand, therefore, that either water should be used, or some preparation from grapes instead of wine, such as we commonly understand by the word: and, of course, they will not communicate where such wine is used. "The pledge," therefore, if there be not a special proviso in this behalf, is virtually a pledge not to partake of the Sacrament ordained by Christ, as the Church of Christ has always understood and ministered it. And what fruit is to be expected from such a pledge as this?

A substitute for the usual wine has been advertised, under the name of juice of the grape or fruit of the vine, and it is pretended that it is free from alcohol. But this it cannot be: for in the juice of the grape, and in extracts or infusions of it, there is alcohol, either latent or developed.

But to obtain a scriptural sanction for their theory, they say that the wine, with which our Lord celebrated and instituted this Sacrament, was not such wine as we commonly understand to be meant by the word. It was not such wine, they say, as, if taken to excess, would produce intoxication. Of course, they easily arrive at this conclusion for themselves: for "what men wish, they readily think." But they endeavour to persuade others, briefly in this way.—In some countries, of old, wine was made in two ways: by keeping the juice extracted from the grapes free from fermentation, or by subjecting it to that process. In the former state, it was drunk fresh in the grape season; or it was boiled down to a syrup, or impregnated slightly

with sulphur. Such wine would keep for any reasonable time, and would never intoxicate; while fermented wine, as we know, will intoxicate. Unfermented wine was, therefore, made in Judæa. It is made now in some wine countries, especially to aid in processes of the making of other wines. It is of unfermented wine that such things are said, as that it "maketh glad the heart of man;" it is of fermented wine, that such things are said, as that it "is a mocker." The first is good and to be enjoyed: the other is bad, and to be refused. Therefore our Lord would not use fermented, and must have used unfermented, wine.

Such is the line of argument, backed up by various subsidiary reasons and speculations, and enforced upon the conscience by many very excellent considerations. All it needs is a basis of unquestionable truth. Whereas, it is only argumentation or speculation, more or less probable or improbable. We cannot know for certain, whether the wine used by our Lord in the institution was fermented or unfermented. We only know that it was wine which He used, such as was in common use. It does not seem to me, therefore, necessary to be determined, or indeed rightly to be determined, whether the wine for this Sacrament should be the one or the other of the two kinds. If real wine, the juice of the grape, be provided, it is sufficient, if sound; and no one, I must think, ought to take objection. It ought to be enough, one would think, for advocates of total abstinence, to remember that, in effect, the quantity taken by each communicant is so very small, that it can matter nothing or next to nothing, whether the wine be fermented or unfermented; and that in principle, the Sacrament being *sui generis*, their conscience may be, and ought to be, free from all offence, in communicating with their fellow-Christians. It cannot matter so much, as to justify any Christians in neglect of the Communion with the fellow-members of the same Saviour.

It is unlike the question, whether the bread used and to be used, should be leavened or unleavened, in this respect:—that there is no clear law which prescribed unfermented wine, as there was a law which prescribed unleavened bread, at the season when the Sacrament was instituted. It was certainly enjoined, that they should "put away leaven seven days," and that for that space of time, "no leaven should be seen in all their quarters;" but a distinction is to be made between that which is leavened, and that which is fermented; and while leavened bread was excluded from the catalogue of things

which might be offered on the altar, we do not find that fermented wine was not to be used for the drink offerings with the morning and evening sacrifices, either daily or during the feast of the Passover.

That our Lord used unleavened bread is certain; but that He used unfermented wine is not certain. Nor has there been any tradition in the Church from the original ordinance of this Sacrament, that the wine which He used in it was unfermented. He used bread, and He used wine; and as it must be allowed to be a thing indifferent, and to be decided by every Church for itself, whether the bread for the Eucharist be leavened or unleavened, it must be equally indifferent, and equally within the privilege of every Church to determine, whether the wine to be used in its Eucharists be fermented or unfermented. But it is necessary that there should be wine for this Sacrament, as one of its elements and outward signs: wine, whether it be the fresh juice of the grape, or inspissated, or fermented; seeing that it was the "fruit of the vine," which our Lord took.

It must, however, be noticed that it was the fruit of the vine in the state in which it was customary to use it. There are no grounds for supposing that it was in any other state. In sitting down to a meal in the houses of those who invited Him to eat with them, we must presume that He did as He directed his disciples to do; that He ate and drank such things as were set before Him; and we know that in this He encountered the reproach of being "a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber." To drink luscious, unfermented wine, of which it is to be supposed that one could not take much, would be small ground of reproach; but to drink wine that would intoxicate, and thus allow of the insinuation of drunkenness, was more to the mind of the accusers. Nor do I find any indication that the wine in common use was such as could not inebriate. There is no indication in the New Testament of any wine which could not. The disciples on the day of Pentecost were thought to be intoxicated with "new wine:" and St. Paul cautions the Ephesians that they "be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess." No wine free from inebriating qualities is mentioned. But it is to be particularly noticed that the wine used in the celebration of the Eucharist at Corinth was fermented, for St. Paul charged some of the people there with drinking to excess, and so being "drunken." *

* 1 Cor. xi. 21.

There is no sufficient reason, then, for supposing that the wine which our Lord usually drank was not fermented, nor is there any sufficient reason for supposing that the wine which He used in the Paschal Supper and the institution of the Eucharist was different, in this respect, from that which He was accustomed to take. If He drank fermented wine usually, we may very well believe that He had such wine in celebrating the Passover; and, as it cannot be proved that He had unfermented wine, it is evident both that unfermented wine is not to be required, and that fermented wine is not to be condemned, in the Eucharist.

I must not pursue the question of Total Abstinence further. I honour the zeal of its advocates. I honour their self-denial. But I cannot commend their wisdom or charity.

Now in preparing the elements for sacramental use, it was an ancient and all but universal custom to add a small portion of water to the wine.* Justin Martyr, in the earlier part of the second century, makes mention of it; but we do not find any mention of it before his time. Its existence at that time certainly argues a higher origin. But since there are no traces of it earlier, and there is no foundation whatever for it in Holy Scripture, I cannot allow it to be strictly and properly Catholic.²⁵

The custom may, indeed, have originated in the circumstances that, with the Communion, the early Christians, from the time that they had all things in common, used to partake together of a temperate repast, which was called Agape, or "a Feast of Charity:" † that in this feast, the use of pure, unmixed wine had sometimes, as perhaps in the case of the Corinthians, led to much excess and disorder; that, therefore, prudence dictated the practice of mixing some water with the wine previously; and that, as the elements for the Holy Communion were the same as the provisions for the Agape, being both of them taken out of the common oblations of the people,‡ the wine was mixed with water in both cases. According to this

* See Appendix N.

²⁵ Bishop Cosin says that "for the approbation of our most common practice, which is to consecrate wine alone without water, we have all this in our favour; the Greeks did it."—Niceph. Callist. lib. xviii. cap. 53; Innocent III. De Myst. Miss. lib. iv. cap. 32; Durand, lib. iv. dist. 12, q. 5; Lombard, lib. iv. d. 11; Bonav. *ibid.*; Notes on the Book of Common Prayer, 1st series. Works, Oxford, 1855, v. 154.

† Jude 12.

‡ See Cyprian De Opere et Eleemosynis, 12, or his treatise in the Library of the Fathers, No. x. 12, pp. 240, 241. In Cave's Primitive Christianity, I. xi. is a brief account of the manner in which the Eucharist was celebrated in early times.

theory, the use of the mixed cup, though not established by apostolical institution, would yet have apostolical sanction.

But many ascribe the custom to a much higher and weightier authority, the example of our Lord Himself. For it is said by those who are learned in Jewish antiquities, that the wine ordinarily used in Palestine, and especially at the Paschal feast, was mixed with water, and it is inferred that, in all probability, the wine used by our Lord in his last Supper, and in the Eucharist with which He concluded it, was mixed with water accordingly.

First, however, "a learned person, and extremely well versed in the knowledge of the uses and customs of that nation," Buxtorf, as cited by L'Arroque,* observes that "the Jewish Rituals left it unto the free will and choice of every person to use pure wine, or wine mixt with water."

And with this Lightfoot agrees, for he says, quoting the Rabbins: "if one has drunk wine pure, and not mixed with water, he has performed his duty, though commonly they mix water with it." If, therefore, our Lord used unmixed wine in the Paschal Supper, He performed his duty, *prestavit officium*, as a Jew; and if He used unmixed wine in the Supper, He used the same in the institution of the Eucharist. There is nothing in the known customs of the Jews to establish the probability that our Lord used mixed wine at that time.†

Buxtorf, in his "Synagoga Judaica," gives ample details of the habits of the Jews in their ordinary meals, and in the celebration of the Passover; and I do not find any mention of a cup of wine diluted with water in either case.

But there is a passage in Isaiah, which would seem sufficient to turn the balance, and to establish the probability that the wine which our Lord took for the Sacrament was pure and unmixed. In describing the debased and depraved condition of Jerusalem in the time of his prophecy, Isaiah says to the once "faithful city," amongst other marks of her condition, "Thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixed with water."‡ And the question has been pertinently and forcibly put by Mr. Malan, so well known for his oriental learning: "Is it likely that our Saviour would bless, as emblem of his blood, a kind of wine spoken of by his prophet as adulterated?"§ One must answer that it is very unlikely.

* History of the Eucharist, p. 3.

† See Wheatley On Common Prayer, VI. x.

‡ Ch. i. ver. 22.

§ His work On the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (Lond. 1868) will well repay the most careful study.

Again, even supposing that a mixed cup was used by our Lord at his last supper, it is clear from the case of the Corinthians, that it was not considered to be obligatory in the Eucharist. A cup mixed at the Passover would be mixed solely to reduce its strength, and to guard against insobriety: and if such a cup were used in the Sacrament, there would be little danger of this offence. But the cup at Corinth was strong enough to intoxicate those who abused it.*

Here, too, I must observe, that this alleged origin of the mixed cup is quite inconsistent with the practice of those who say that the mixed cup is obligatory. If the cup was mixed amongst the Jews, it was for the sake of sobriety; and it had, as it is thought, an equal, if not a considerably larger quantity of water in proportion to the wine. Whereas it is the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome,²⁶ and of those in the Church of England who use a mixed cup, that only a very small portion of water is to be added to the wine, lest it should cease to be, and to be rightly called, wine. There is thus an irreconcilable difference between the use of the mixed cup in the Christian Sacrament, and its supposed origin in the Jewish feast. In one, there would be a large or preponderating quantity of water in proportion to the wine, so as greatly to weaken it: in the other, the proportion of water is so small as not to affect its strength. In one, the use of water was for sobriety; in the other, it is for signification.

In the inspired records of the institution of the Eucharist, we look in vain for any indications of a mixed cup. The Evangelists speak only of "the fruit of the vine," without any mention whatever of water; and there is nothing in their accounts to indicate or to suggest that "the fruit of the vine" was diluted with water. The supposition of any mixture is altogether unnecessary, nor is it implied, even remotely, in the authenticated facts.

From these considerations, I must think that the more

* See Appendix O.

²⁶ "Debet autem aqua vino admiscenda—esse modicissima; cujus ratio physica est, ne vinum præsertim debile corrumpetur: ratio mystica est, quod aqua significat populum fidelem, vinum autem ipsum Christum; deest autem, ut ipsum caput Christus expressius representetur, quam populus, qui illi adunatur."—Dens, v. 272.

"But the water to be mixed with the wine ought to be very moderate in quantity; of which there is a physical reason, lest wine, especially weak wine, be corrupted: a mystical reason is, that the water represents the faithful people, but the wine Christ Himself; but it is fit that the head Himself, Christ, should be more clearly represented, than the people who are united to Him."

probable origin of the mixed cup is to be found, as I have pointed out, in such abuses as those exposed by St. Paul amongst the Corinthians. It was a precaution against insobriety in the Agape, but not necessary, or of any significance in the Eucharist.

The true origin of the custom would be its best defence: and not only this, but the best guide in its practice. If it was known that our Lord used a mixed cup in the institution, and if it was considered necessary to use a mixed cup in the celebration of the Eucharist, then it might follow that we ought to do the same now. But it would also follow that we must use a cup of wine diluted with much more water. But if it was not considered whether He used a cup of pure or of mixed wine; and if the mixed cup came to be used only as a precaution in the Agape, then it is a matter of indifference whether it be a pure or a mixed cup in the Eucharist. It would seem to be most accordant with the circumstances of the institution, and with its intention, that the wine should be such as would be prepared for an ordinary meal; and where the custom might be, from the strength of the wine or other causes, to dilute it with water, there seems to be no reason for objecting to wine so mixed for the Sacrament, provided only that the proportion of water be so small that the mixture should not cease to be wine. Though, in truth, the mixture of so small a quantity of water with the wine is not consistent with the reason for diluting wine for ordinary meals.

It must also be borne in mind, that the same principle applies to both of the elements; and, therefore, that if it were as certain that our Lord used a mixed cup, as it is that He used unleavened bread, it would be no more necessary for us to use a mixed cup now than it is acknowledged to be that we should use unleavened bread. And it is equally within the power of any national Church to determine for its ministers and people, whether they shall, or shall not, have a mixed cup, as it is to determine whether the bread shall be leavened or unleavened.

The mixed cup is, indeed, the general rule throughout Christendom. After its introduction it was the rule in the Church of England, until the publication of the Second Book of King Edward VI., in which the previous Rubric, which re-

quired the officiating priest to add "a little pure and clean water" to the wine in the chalice, was omitted. And now it has become a question what the effect of the omission is; whether the omission of the Rubric is equivalent to its repeal, or whether it may still be observed. It is argued that "omission is not prohibition;" but it seems to be forgotten that it is not authorisation. We know nothing of the First Book of Edward VI., or of any previous Liturgies, but as matters of history, excepting where the present Book refers to the First of Edward for things in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of his reign. They have no manner of authority over us in the performance of divine service. We are simply bound by the Book of Common Prayer as it is; and we have no authority but to celebrate the Services of the Church as it directs, or as it necessarily implies or requires, and as interpreted by a custom not contrariant to it. To it alone are the clergy bound. They have entered into no obligations to follow any other rule, in whatever degree or way, combined with it. It is their only authority: so that for things omitted in it, and not necessarily implied or required for the fulfilment of its directions, or sanctioned by consonant custom, no other rule can bind them or be their warrant.

From this it necessarily follows that, whatever may have been the Rubric in the First Book of Edward VI., the clergy of the present day have nothing to do with it. There is no direction in our present Book to add water to the wine in the chalice for consecration. A Priest has no right to do it; and what he has no right to do he cannot reasonably expect his congregation, or the superior powers, to wink at or to allow.

But a distinction must be made about the use of a mixed cup, if one be determined to use it. If the addition of water to the wine be made in the Service, a ceremony is introduced into it, which has no authority from the Book of Common Prayer, and is neither necessarily implied or required for the fulfilment of its directions, nor sanctioned by non-contrariant custom: for the custom is but recent, or recently revived, and is partial, followed by very few; though one, here and there, may perhaps be traced through a considerable period, who is said to have practised it. Foremost among these, may be said to be Bishop Andrewes, who once used a mixed cup after the Rubric had ceased to direct it; and, consequently, when there was no more authority for it than there is now. But the

Bishop attached far less importance to this practice than his imitators, for having noticed that "Saint Chrysostom seemeth²⁷ to oppose it," he said: "We hold it a matter not worth the standing on: so all else were agreed, we would not stick with them to put as much *water* in as the priests use to do."* He is evidently speaking on the part of those who did not put water in, and treats it as a matter of indifference which they were willing to concede, provided there could be agreement in "all else." Such agreement accomplished, and this practice being "a matter not worth the standing on," they would concede it for peace sake, and would "put as much water in as the [Romish] priests use to do." This shows that it was not the rule or practice of those for whom Bishop Andrewes spoke: and as he said, "we," it would follow that it was not his own rule or practice when he wrote. It would be well if those who plead the authority of this venerated bishop would follow his example, and make the mixing of water with the wine of the Eucharist of as small importance as he did. He would certainly not have maintained it as a Catholic practice to which the Church is bound, on pain of losing its Catholicity.

But the judge of the Court of Arches has, by two recent decisions, distinctly declared, that the introduction of the ceremony of mixing water with the wine in the course of the Service, is clearly illegal in the Church of England. Yet depending on the example of Bishop Andrewes, and the antiquity of the practice as shown by Bishop Cosin and Mr. Palmer, he said that he agreed in the opinion, that "provided the mingling [of the water with the wine] be not made at the time of the celebration, so as to constitute a new rite or ceremony," the mixed cup may nevertheless be used; that is, that water may be added to the wine, in the vestry or elsewhere, previous to the commencement of the Communion Service, but not afterwards, not in any part, or as any part, of the Service.

There would certainly be no open breach of the Rubric or violation of its spirit; but, reverting to the origin of the practice, whether it be from the alleged use of a mixed cup by our Lord at the institution, or from prudence, in view of the abuses alluded to by St. Paul amongst the Corinthians, it

²⁷ It appears to me that St. Chrysostom does oppose it. He represents that our Lord gave wine in the mysteries, and at a meal without mysteries after his resurrection, drank wine, of the fruit of the vine, "but the vine," he says, "produces wine, not water."—Hom. in Matt. xxvi. 27.

* Answer to Cardinal Perron. Minor Works, Oxford, 1854, 25.

must be seen, that the sole reason of the mixed cup in both cases was the insuring of sobriety. It was for this purpose only that it was used among the Jews; and for the same purpose only was it introduced, as it would seem, amongst the Corinthians. The wine was mixed with water, in both cases, for sobriety. What ground is there, then, in either aspect, for using the mixed cup for signification? And in mixing the cup amongst the Jews, an equal quantity, or twice or thrice the quantity, of water was put in; a circumstance which makes it very improbable that our Lord should have used a cup so mixed; for He called that which He did use "the fruit of the vine," which would appear to be a miscalling it, if it had been mixed with so large a quantity of water.

So inconsistent, then, is the present use of the mixed cup with its origin amongst the Jews. If our Lord used it, He did it in conformity with a custom adopted for sobriety; it is now used for signification. In its origin, the quantity of water equalled or greatly exceeded the quantity of wine, so as greatly to weaken it, and make it no longer true wine: but as employed for the Eucharist, the quantity of water is very small, so as still to leave its true character to the wine.

And again, if the mixture be made in the vestry, and not during the Service in sight of the congregation, any signification the Priest may attach to it, or may think it has, is lost to them.

Joining, then, these considerations with the fact, that the Church of England requires the curate and churchwardens to "provide a sufficient quantity of good and wholesome wine, for the number of communicants,—which wine," is "to be brought to the communion-table in a clean and sweet standing pot or stoop;" * and that she gives no directions, no authority whatever, for adding water to this wine at any time: it is clearly a thing altogether unauthorised by the Church to do this even in private in the vestry. Forbidden, indeed, it is not; but this, evidently, it was not necessary it should be; for of a long series of years the mixture had been made only in and as part of the Service. No one then thought of mixing the wine beforehand.

The conclusion, I must think, is inevitable, that the mixture of water with the Sacramental wine before the Service is as

* Canon 20.

inconsistent with the spirit and intention of the Church of England, as it is illegal to be made in and as part of the Service.*

* The Court of Appeal has decided against the use of wafers and of a mixed cup. But I regret to see that Dr. Pusey, in the postscript to his Letter to Dr. Liddon, has ventured to assert as much, as that the Cup used by our Lord was mixed, so confidently as to challenge prosecution for the use of a mixed cup himself; and to encourage others in a threatened defiance of the law. I must say that I think this very weak and unwise. A Gentile custom cannot prove a Jewish custom: much less can it prove what our Lord did, as Dr. Pusey seems to intimate. Neither can the custom spoken of by Justin Martyr, and subsequent writers, prove the point: for that custom might have originated in apostolical prudence, as has been shown, without the supposition of a Divine precedent.

CHAPTER IV.

CONSECRATION.

HAVING determined what the outward signs or elements in the Eucharist, ordained by our Lord Jesus Christ, are ; and having ascertained the law and mind of the Church of England in regard to them, as either required or allowed in her Services ; we have next to consider how they are to be used.

It has been seen, that bread, of fine wheat-flour, and wine from the vine, are, throughout Christendom, the necessary elements of this Sacrament : and particularly, in the Church of England, that bread of fine wheat-flour, leavened or unleavened, according as either may be commonly used in any place ; and wine, not mixed with any water in the Service, are required.

With these we approach and worship God. With bread and wine, ordained by our Lord Himself, instead of sacrifices, made, as in former dispensations, by fire, we offer adoration and praise to the Father of all, through his Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ. And in doing this, the all-gracious Founder of this rite must be taken for our guide. His deed and example must, in all essential things, be the rule of our Liturgy.

Here, then, is the grand law of Christ's Church in this Sacrament, as it has before been cited : " Jesus took the bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat ; this is my body, which is given for you : this do in remembrance of me : and after the same manner also He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it. For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins : this do ye, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me."

" This do ye," He said ; and thus not only ordained bread and wine, but showed how it was his will that we should use them. He took the bread and the cup, He blessed them, giving thanks to God. He brake the bread, and gave it to the disciples. The

cup also He gave to them, telling them all to drink it. He said of the bread, "This is my body, which is given for you," and of the cup, "This is my blood which is shed for you." And of both the bread and the cup He said, "This do ye, in remembrance of me."

By following his example, we have the perfect Sacrament, the outward signs and the things signified. By that which He did and said, He consecrated the bread and wine, and made them to be that which He called them, his body and blood: and by his power and grace, the same effect follows upon his ministers doing and saying the same things. His own command, "Do this," implies, and virtually is, a promise that it should be so. They, to whom He said it, were to "do this," in order that they might be partakers of his body and blood. In order to eat his flesh and drink his blood, to have eternal life, and the promise of being raised up at the last day, they were to do as He did.

So St. Paul understood the matter, and so he celebrated the Eucharist. He blessed "the cup of blessing," that it might be "a communion of the blood of Christ," and he brake the bread, that it might be "a communion of the body of Christ," to all who were "partakers of that one bread." This divine Liturgy he had "received of the Lord," and he "delivered" it unto those for whom he ministered. And he "delivered" it, not as a thing merely to be known and believed, but as a thing to be done, to be observed, to be celebrated. For it was only the food with which this was done, which made the table "the Lord's table:" it was only the food and liquid thus blessed, in which the Lord's body and blood were to be "discerned." "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord."* What bread and what cup? that bread and that cup only, so blessed, and broken, and given. And that bread and that cup,

* 1 Cor. ix. x.

so fearful to partakers of them unworthily, are full of grace to those who worthily receive them. It is this one bread eaten, and this one cup drunk; this bread and this cup, taken as St. Paul received of the Lord and delivered to his people, by which is shown forth "the Lord's death till He come."

And as St. Paul "received of the Lord," and "delivered" this divine Liturgy, the same did all the other apostles also receive and deliver. And so from them to this day, has "the Holy Church throughout all the world," professed to minister it. Thus, we have a truly Catholic tradition; a practice having a clear foundation in the Word of God, handed down by the very first Fathers; celebrated always, everywhere, and by all.

Some, indeed, misapprehending a most probable, and, one might say, necessary fact, have thought that the apostles consecrated with the Lord's Prayer only. For they would not celebrate so solemn a Service without prayer; and of all prayers, the Lord's Prayer would be the prayer used, if only one prayer was said; and it would be the chief prayer amongst others. They would be sure to say it in any religious Service, since He had instructed them to say it when they prayed. It might certainly be, at times, the only prayer; but its being the only prayer would not prove that they did not do and say as our Lord Himself did in the institution: nor would it render it unnecessary that they should do so. And, besides this, as our Lord gave thanks, so would they, in fulfilling his command, "Do this," give thanks also.

From these, the first and best of the Fathers, has come in unbroken and universal tradition and practice, the offering of thanks in the Holy Communion; from which, indeed, it takes the name of Eucharist. The earliest record of this Sacrament, after the New Testament, tells us that "the presiding Minister," having taken the elements, "sends up praise and glory to the Father of all through the name of his Son and the Holy Ghost, and makes thanksgiving at great length."* And in the Clementine Liturgy—the most full example which we have of the earliest Liturgies—is a very lengthened recital of the various things in providence and grace for which we are bound to give God thanks.

The necessity of some form is evident; some form which shall sufficiently designate the purpose for which the elements

* Justin Martyr, Apol. I. lxxv.

of bread and wine are to be used, and which shall devote them to that purpose; for otherwise the partaking of them would be a mere Agape, or a common public meal. The form which our Lord set is divine: there can be no better: and as He said "Do this," we must conclude that there can be no other, which shall rightly consecrate the Eucharist. And no other form substantially differing from this, can be counted for a valid consecration.

It is not to be thought, however, that any Church would deem thanksgiving, the Lord's Prayer, and the words of institution sufficient for the edification and devotion of its members. And no objection could be justly made against the addition by any Church, to these elementary forms, of other forms suitably expressing the faith and charity, the contrition and thankfulness, which are requisite in such as would receive the Sacrament to their benefit. The Church of England, by the good providence and grace of God, happily possesses in her "Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper" a model of such devotions as befit this holy rite; in which, vain and superstitious forms being rejected, we have the true faith set forth, charity towards all men professed and exercised, confession made of sins, and the praises of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the salvation of men, humbly and thankfully proclaimed.

The necessary and sufficient form of consecration of the Eucharist, then, being that which was set by our Lord Jesus Christ, and delivered to us in the New Testament, questions have been raised whether the consecration was effected by the whole form, or by any particular part; and if by any particular part, by what part. Some, indeed, have held that our Lord Himself consecrated by the thanksgiving or benediction, and not by the acts and words of the institution. And Albertin gives us, from *Christophorus de Capite fontium*, Archbishop of Cæsarea, seven different opinions which were held on this subject by Popes and great divines of the Church of Rome: * one of the many things which expose the hollowness of that Church's boasted unity.

Such questions mostly arise from notions of a change in the elements beyond that of their use and application; a change metaphysically, or by the supervention of another substance, or conversion into it. It would be a fruitless labour to deal with

* De Eucharistiæ Sacramento, l. iv. 7; Daventriæ, 7.

such questions. They savour more of curious and vexatious trifling, than of serious importance.

It is, and must be, sufficient to know, that when the example of our Lord's acts and words in the institution is faithfully followed, the consecration is valid and complete. When all that He did and said is rightly done and said by the Priest, all that He engaged Himself to, and intended, takes place. The bread becomes his body, and the wine becomes his blood, in the sense intended by Him.

And here simple faith would rest, without enquiring, "How can these things be?"—satisfied that He, by whom the world was made, by whom all things consist, and all things shall be made new, has said it, and surely makes his word good. By what means, indeed, He makes the bread become his body, and the wine his blood, we have here briefly to declare. It was not the faith of the apostles, nor their communicating, which made the elements to be what our Lord said they were: for He said the word, and it was true, before they could believe, and before they communicated. And therefore it is neither the faith nor the communion of his people which now makes the bread to be the body, and the wine to be the blood of Christ. It is the word and power of our Lord and God only that make them to be that which He spake of them.

But in what way He makes them to be this, we know not. He has kept this secret, and therefore the wisdom of man is unable to find it out; and all his efforts and speculations on this must be fruitless, if not worse. Here is fixed a mystery, which faith may embrace, though wisdom is unable to penetrate it. We may believe his word, though we are not able to see or to understand his work.

CHAPTER V.

THE EFFECTS OF CONSECRATION.

NEXT to the form of consecration of the Eucharist, we have to consider its effects.

This is declared by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself; for He said of the bread, "This is my body which is given for you;" and of the wine, "This is my blood which is shed for you."

The Church of the apostles, and of their successors for a considerable time, was contented with a simple faith in these words. There was no enquiry, "How can these things be?" And none seem to have gone beyond the interpretation of the apostle: "the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"

But reason ceased in time to give a simple acquiescence to the truth. Men began to ask themselves, "How can these things be?" and to assign, as best they could, something like a mode in which they could conceive that our Lord's words might be realised. And this they did, not in some purely rationalistic way, but by the misapplication of other undoubted truths, coupled with a misconception of the truth which they desired to explain. They began to look upon the bread and wine of the Eucharist as in themselves, somehow or other, really that which they signified. They therefore imagined some change to have been effected within and upon them, whereby they became the very body and blood of Christ; and as this change was contrary to the order of nature, they were confident that the order of grace assured them of its reality as well as possibility. And this supernatural change they ascribed to the power of the Holy Spirit; because, as He is the Author of the supernatural change of the new birth and of all grace, they conceived, very naturally indeed, that the addition of grace to nature in the elements must be his work also.

Thus, rationalism began a work in the Eucharist, which it

unceasingly continued, until its speculations culminated in Transubstantiation, with its consequent and kindred doctrines.

But rationalism has exhibited itself also in the opposite extreme. Some, seeing insuperable difficulties to reason and faith in Transubstantiation, have denied all reality in our Lord's words. Presuming on their own understanding, they have propounded theories of the Eucharist which amount, in fact, to a contradiction of Christ; determining that the bread is not, and cannot be truly called, his body; and that the wine is not, and cannot be truly called, his blood. In short, they disembowel the Sacrament of its truth and grace; and turn it into a mere ceremony, by which they profess their faith towards God, and their fellowship with men. These, in opposition to the former sort, have determined, that there is no way in which the bread and wine can be the body and blood of Christ.*

The first symptom or manifestation of rationalism in the doctrine of the Eucharist was, I think, in the notion expressed by St. Cyril of Alexandria, in the fifth century, that "God sendeth forth a power of life into the elements, and transfers them into the efficacy of His own Flesh."† The notion may have been entertained and expressed before his time: but this is not certain; though it seems very likely to have occurred when people once began to imagine that the bread and wine received some change in themselves, by which they became the body and blood of Christ. They never imagined that the bread and wine were, in strict reality, his body and blood: but they supposed that if they had the same powers or effect as his body and blood, it would be a sufficient reason to call them by those names. They therefore conceived the bread and wine to have embodied in them the same powers as the real flesh and blood of Christ. And thus St. Cyril spoke of God sending forth a power of life into the elements, and "transferring them into the efficacy of His own Flesh."

This was clearly assigning a way in which the bread is the body, and the wine is the blood, of the Lord. It was not rationalism. But it was more: it was a departure from our Lord's words. St. Cyril, of course, did not suspect this. But it was a fact, nevertheless. Our Lord said, "This is my body, This is my blood." He did not say, nor do his words intimate, that the bread was his body and the wine his blood, by "a

* See Appendix P. † Dr. Pusey's *Doctrine of the Real Presence*, 175.

power of life sent into them” or by a transference “into the efficacy of His own Flesh.” To assign such a mode, is, in effect, to deny the Lord’s words.

Then, since the Holy Ghost is with the Church in the stead of Christ, and is its Comforter and Sanctifier, this change, supposed to be made in the elements, was attributed to this Divine Person. Eusebius of Cæsarea, therefore, said, that “God —by the Holy Ghost hallows the gifts;—and the Bread becometh the Body, and the Cup becometh the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.” *

From this, a formal prayer began to be made that God would do what they conceived Him to do; that He would hallow the gifts by the Holy Ghost: that He would send Him down upon them to make them to us the body and blood of his Son: which seems to have been shortened and altered in doctrine, by omitting “to us;” so that the prayer became, in effect, simply, that God by his Holy Spirit would make the elements, and change them into, the body and blood of Christ; not indeed positively and actually in themselves, but in order to certain effects.

This Invocation, of which I have treated in another chapter, became a distinguishing part of the Liturgies of one great portion of the Church, and it is retained to this day in the East. But the effect of the descent of the Spirit upon the gifts is much disputed: some maintaining that it is it which changes them into the body and blood of Christ: some insisting that this effect is the cause jointly of the recital of our Lord’s words, and the Invocation: and some that our Lord’s words only make the change; and consequently that the operation of the Spirit is properly on the communicants through the bread and wine hallowed by Him.

But the doctrine of the Church of Rome is an extreme type of rationalism on this subject; for she determines for herself and all the world, a way in which our Lord’s words are to be fulfilled; and challenges assent under penalty of her heaviest anathema. But she overlooks, as will be seen, the true scriptural premisses, and gets to her conclusion by a totally illicit process.

The doctrine of the Church of Rome is designated by the

* Dr. Pusey’s Doctrine of the Real Presence, 452.

name of Transubstantiation, a name of later mediæval date: for the doctrine itself is only of that period. Giesler* says that the name was used by Petrus Damianus in his Exposition of the Canon of the Mass in A.D. 1057. Hildebertus Cenomannensis, nearly fifty years later, is said to have used it. And the verb was used about the same time by Petrus Blæsensis and Stephanus Eduensis.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation is,† that, as soon as ever the words of consecration have been spoken by the Priest, “our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and Man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of” the bread and wine: that He is thus contained under the species from “a conversion which is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood:” that “the true body of the Lord and his true blood are under the species of bread and wine, together with his soul and Divinity: but the body indeed under the species of bread, and the blood under the species of wine, from the power of the words [of consecration]; yet the body itself under the species of wine, and the blood under the species of bread, and the soul under either, by the power of that natural connection and concomitance, by which the parts of the Lord Christ, who is now risen from the dead, to die no more, are mutually joined together: the Divinity, moreover, on account of that wonderful hypostatic union of it with his body and soul:” that “it is therefore most true that as much is contained under either species as under each, inasmuch as Christ whole and entire is under the species of bread, and under any part soever of that species; whole also under the species of wine, and under its parts.²³

* *Eccles. Hist.* iii. 315, 316. Clarke's Edition. See also Waterland's Review. Works, Oxf. vii. 182, and Cave, *Hist. Lit.*, ii. 234.

† See Appendix Q.

²³ “In almo sanctæ Eucharistiæ sacramento, post panis et vini consecrationem. Dominum nostrum, Jesum Christum, verum Deum, atque hominem, vere, realiter, et substantialiter, sub specie illarum rerum sensibilium contineri.—Conversionem fieri totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi, Domini nostri, et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus.—Verum Domini nostri corpus, verumque ejus sanguinem sub panis et vini specie una cum ipsius anima et Divinitate existere; sed corpus quidem sub specie panis, et sanguinem sub specie vini, ex vi verborum, ipsum autem corpus sub specie vini, et sanguinem sub specie panis, animamque sub utraque, vi naturalis illius connexionis, et concomitantiæ, qua partes Christi Domini, qui jam ex mortuis resurrexit, non amplius moriturus, inter se copulantur. Divinitatem porro propter admirabilem illam ejus cum corpore et anima hypostaticam unionem. Quapropter verissimum est tantundem sub alterutra specie, atque sub utraque contineri:

Such is the definition of the doctrine as given by the Council of Trent: and its Catechism further explains "that not only the true body of Christ, and whatsoever pertains to the true nature of a body, as bones and nerves; but also whole Christ is contained in this Sacrament: that Christ is the name of God and man, of one person namely, in which the Divine and the human nature is conjoined: that therefore He embraces both substances, and all things that belong to each substance, the Divinity, and the whole human nature, which consists of the soul and of all the parts of the body, and of the blood also: all which must be believed to be in the Sacrament. For since in heaven the entire humanity is conjoined with the Divinity in one person and hypostasis, it is impiety to suppose that the body which is in the Sacrament, is separated from the same Divinity."²⁹

The Council, moreover, explains that "there is no opposition between our Saviour Himself sitting at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of being; and nevertheless, sacramentally present, being with us in his own substance in many other places, in that mode of existence, which, although we can hardly express it in words, we can yet, by thought enlightened by faith, attain to as possible to God, and ought most constantly to believe."^{* 30}

The substances of the bread and wine, also, being converted into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, are said to leave only their accidents remaining, such as their size, form, colour, and taste, capability of nourishing, and liability to corruption: in short, though the substance is changed, and the bread is no longer bread, and the wine is no longer wine, yet that which remains, call it species or accidents, is, to all natural

totus enim et integer Christus sub panis specie, et sub quavis ipsius speciei parte; totus item sub vini specie, et sub ejus partibus existit.—Canon. Conc. Trid. Sess. xiii. cc. i. iv. iii.

²⁹ "Jam vero hoc loco a pastoribus explicandum est non solum verum Christi corpus, et quidquid ad veram corporis rationem pertinet, velut ossa et nervos; sed etiam totum Christum in hoc sacramento contineri. Docere autem oportet Christum nomen esse Dei et hominis, unius scilicet personæ in qua divina et humana natura conjuncta sit: quare utramque substantiam, et quæ utriusque substantiæ consequentia sunt, divinitatem et totam humanam naturam quæ ex anima et omnibus corporis partibus et sanguine etiam constat complectitur: quæ omnia in sacramento esse credendum est. Nam cum in cælo tota humanitas divinitati in una persona et hypostasi conjuncta sit, nefas est suspicari corpus quod in sacramento inest, ab eadem divinitate sejunctum esse."—Pars II. De Eucharistiæ Sacramento, xxxi.

* Appendix S.

³⁰ "Nec enim hæc inter se pugnant, ut ipse Salvator noster semper ad dexteram Patris in cælis assideat, juxta modum existendi naturalem; et ut multis nihilominus aliis in locis, sacramentaliter præsens, sua substantia nobis adsit, ea existendi ratione, quam, etsi verbis exprimere vix possumus, possibilem tamen esse Deo, cogitatione per fidem illustrata, assequi possumus, et constantissime credere debemus."—Conc. Trid. Sess. xiii. c. i.

effects and purposes, bread and wine still, and indeed may be called by these names.*³¹

In like manner, the Lutheran doctrine, which is commonly called by the name of Consubstantiation, defines another mode in which it has been conceived that the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ.

Luther himself thus describes it: "The bread should be understood to be true bread, and the wine true wine, as [we understand] that it was a true cup:—true bread and true wine in which is the true flesh and the true blood of Christ, not otherwise or less than they put them under the accidents: both, [Christ and the bread and wine,] at the same time remaining [unchanged]:—so that the body is even in the bread in such sort, that it is actually eaten with the bread: and that whatsoever motion or action the bread has, the body of Christ also has the same; so that the body of Christ may be truly said to be carried, given, received, eaten, when the bread is carried, given, received, eaten. That is, 'This is my body.'—Behold the two substances, fire and iron, are so mingled in glowing iron, that every part is iron and fire. Why much more may not the glorious body of Christ be thus in every part of the substance of the bread? The body of Christ is in such manner in the Sacrament, the bread [still] remaining, as fire in iron, the substance of the iron remaining; and [as] God in Man, the humanity remaining; the substances, in both cases, being so mingled that its own operation and proper nature should remain to each, and yet they should constitute some one thing."³²

* See Appendix R.

³¹ "Quid agere et pati possunt species in Sacramento remanentes?"

"R. generaliter, omne illud quod agere posset et pati substantia Panis et Vini, si adhuc adesset: et sic species consecratæ agunt in alia corpora, et vicissim ab ipsis patiuntur: sumptæ nutriunt, alterantur, corrumpuntur, quin et earum corruptione quandoque aliquid generatur, hæc omnia Deo sic mirabiliter disponente et operante ad celandum mysterium."—Dens, Theol. v. 288, 289, De Euch. n. 26.

"What can the species in the Sacrament do and endure?"

"Speaking generally, all that which the substance of bread and wine could do and endure if it were yet present: and thus the consecrated species act on other bodies, and in turn are acted upon by them: when taken, they nourish, are changed, are corrupted, and moreover by their corruption something is sometimes generated: God so wonderfully disposing and working all these things for the purpose of concealing the mystery."

³² "Verum oportet intelligi panem, verumque vinum, sicut verum calicem.—Tandem stabilivi conscientiam meam sententia priore, Esse, videlicet, verum panem verumque vinum, in quibus Christi vera caro verusque sanguis non aliter nec minus sit, quam illi sub accidentibus ponunt. In Sacramento, ut verum corpus verusque sanguis sit, non est necesse, panem et vinum transubstantiari, ut Christus sub accidentibus teneatur. Sed utroque simul manente vere dicitur: Hic panis est corpus meum, hoc vinum est sanguis meus, et e contra. Nostra autem sententia est, corpus ita vel in pane esse,

Dr. Pusey has two articles to show that this doctrine ought not to be called by the name of Consubstantiation.* He proves that “the belief that the Elements remain after Consecration in their natural substances, was not supposed of old to involve any tenet of Consubstantiation;” and that “Consubstantiation was not held by the Lutheran body.”† And he is most indubitably right, that is, taking Consubstantiation to mean “making two substances to be blended into one.” But I apprehend that this name was not given to the Lutheran doctrine, nor is used of it now, in that strict sense derived from its cognate form “consubstantial,” as predicated of the Holy Trinity. Whether any ever believed or taught such a monstrous doctrine as that the substance of the Lord’s body and blood, and the substance of the bread and wine are so mingled and blended together as to form one physical whole, one homogeneous substance, it is not necessary to enquire: but I cannot deem it unfair to apply the name of Consubstantiation to a doctrine which teaches, that “the true flesh and the true blood of Christ are in the true bread and wine,” in such a way that “whatsoever motion or action the bread” and wine have, the body and blood “of Christ also” have “the same;” and that “the substances in both cases” are “so mingled—that they should constitute some one thing.”

Be the name, however, rightly applied or be it not, it is very natural for Dr. Pusey to deprecate the application: for the doctrine of the Eucharist which he sets forth, and defends with so much zeal, ability, and learning, is scarcely, if at all, to be distinguished from that of Luther. He calls the consecrated bread and wine “elements of this world,—natural elements,” and says that his doctrine “does not involve any physical change in” them, and that “they remain in their natural substance:”—“what was bread remains bread, and what was wine remains wine.” And he has a note, N, exhibiting “the belief of the early Fathers that the Holy Eucharist nourished, which implies that the natural substance remained.” †

ut revera cum pane manducatur; et quemcumque motum vel actionem panis habet, eundem et corpus Christi: ut corpus Christi vere dicatur ferri, dari, accipi, manducari, quando panis fertur, datur, accipitur, manducatur. Id est, *Hoc est corpus meum.*—Ecce ignis et ferrum duæ substantiæ, sic miscentur in ferro ignito, ut quælibet pars sit ferrum et ignis. Cur non multo magis corpus gloriosum Christi, sic in omni parte substantiæ panis esse possit? Corpus Christi sic salvo pane in Sacramento est, sicut est ignis in ferro salva ferri substantia, et Deus in homine, salva humanitate; utrobique sic mixtis substantiis ut sua cuique operatio et natura propria maneat, et tamen unum aliquid constituent.—Contra Regem Angliæ.

* Doctrine of the Real Presence from the Fathers, Notes A and B. pp. 1–36.

† Sermon: “The Presence of Christ,” &c. v. vii. 22, 24: Doctrine, &c. viii.

In the very able and elaborate work of Archdeacon Wilberforce, also, in which the argument runs upon the "Sacramentum," the "Res Sacramenti," and the "Virtus Sacramenti," and their mutual differences and relations; it is necessarily implied that the bread and wine remain physically unchanged: for it is through and in them, the "Sacramentum," that the "Res Sacramenti" is declared to be present. But the Archdeacon clearly says that the two parts continue distinct from each other, and that "the outward and the inward" parts "retain their own character." *

And in the "Tracts for the Day," edited by Mr. Orby Shipley, which seem to express the present sentiments of the party to which he belongs, "the earthly substances of bread and wine" are declared to "remain in their own nature." †

Then, in the bread and wine, or under their form, as it is phrased, Dr. Pusey, with the section of the Church to which he belongs, asserts that there is "the real and objective Presence" of Christ. ‡ Archdeacon Wilberforce more fully expresses this. The outward part, the bread and wine, or the "Sacramentum," remaining physically unchanged, and retaining its natural substance and properties; the "Res Sacramenti," he says, or inward reality, is "the Body and Blood of Christ." This he elsewhere says is "the Body of Christ," not perceiving, or ignoring, the very important difference between these two predicates. He says, moreover, that it is the "Human Body of Christ," "His actual Humanity," or "Manhood," which has taken "up its dwelling in the consecrated elements," and is "contained in" them: His body, but His "glorified Body," exempted from "the laws of nature," and having "new qualities, which our Lord's Humanity has gained by its oneness with Deity:" His Body, implying "Himself, Godhead, Soul, and Body," "by virtue of that personal union, whereby the Manhood was taken up into God:" in short, "the Body of God."

The two parts, the "Sacramentum," and "Res Sacramenti," the sign and the thing signified, the outward and the inward, he says, "are brought together in a permanent relation" to each other, whereby "the outward part or material employed, is invested with permanent efficacy:" the two parts being "bound to one another by a mystic coherence," and "making up together a compound whole," "a real, but heterogeneous whole:"

* Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, Lond. 1853, v. 120.

† No. 5, "The Real Presence," p. 17.

‡ Dr. Pusey's Sermon, vii.

“so united, that they must needs go together; and whoso receives the one, receives the other:” and that Christ’s Body “may be said to have a form in this Sacrament, namely, the form of the elements, and to occupy that place, through which the elements extend,” borrowing “place and shape from the Sacramentum, with which it is united by consecration.”³³ This doctrine, therefore, is as truly deserving of the name of Consubstantiation as the Lutheran is.

Thus these three schemes, the Roman, the Lutheran, and,—how to denominate the third without offence I know not, but I will call it the doctrine of the nineteenth century,*—all agree perfectly together in teaching what Dr. Pusey† has been, I believe, the first to call a “real objective presence” of our Lord Jesus Christ in his glorified body, with his Godhead, under the form of bread and wine. They all affirm that the bread is made the body of Christ, and the wine his blood, by the real, actual, and substantial presence of Christ glorified, whole Christ, Christ in his Manhood and Godhead, either under their form, or joined with their substance.

But that none of these schemes of doctrine set forth the true effect of consecration, we proceed in the next chapter to show.

³³ “Physically unchanged,” p. 120, 121; “Inward reality, the Body and Blood of Christ,” 93, 94, 405; “Human Body,” 172; “Actual Humanity,” 172; “Manhood,” 91; “taken up its dwelling in the consecrated elements,” 172; “contained in them,” 123; “Glorified Body,” 96, 153, 176; “exempted from natural laws,” 158; “having new qualities,” 155; “implying Himself Godhead, Soul, and Body,” 91; “by virtue of that personal union,” 90; “Body of God,” 111.

“Brought together in a permanent relation,” 25; “outward part invested with permanent efficacy,” 25; “bound to one another by a mystic coherence,” 139; “a real, but heterogeneous, a compound whole,” 117, 120; “must needs go together,” 120; “to have the form of the elements,” &c. 164.

* Dr. Pusey in his letter to Dr. Liddon, Monday in Holy Week, 1871, seems to accept the name of “Tractarian” without objection. He says: “We, the older Tractarians,” &c. *The Purchas Judgment, Dr. Liddon’s Letter to the Right Hon. Sir J. T. Coleridge*, ed. 2, p. 54.

† “Finding that the words ‘Real Presence’ were often understood of what is in fact a ‘Real Absence,’ we added the word ‘Objective,’ not as wishing to obtrude on others a term of modern philosophy, but to express that the Life-giving Body, the res sacramenti, is, by virtue of the consecration, present without us,” &c. Sermon, “This is My Body,” preached at Oxford, 5th Sunday after Easter, 1871, p. 40.

CHAPTER VI.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION : CHANGE OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE
ELEMENTS.

THE doctrine of Transubstantiation asserts that the bread and wine in the Eucharist are changed by consecration into the body and blood of Christ, by the conversion of their whole substances respectively into the whole substance of his body and blood; so that their accidents only remain without any part of the substances to which they belonged.

It is not at all necessary to enter into or to notice the scholastic definitions of substance and accidents. The sense in which the Church of Rome employs these words in her decrees on the Eucharist is sufficiently intelligible. By the substances of the bread and wine, she means the reality of these things, that which makes them bread and wine, and without which they could not be bread and wine. And by the accidents or species, she means everything of the bread and wine, but this substance.

It is said, indeed, that the philosophy which divides all created things into substance and accidents, has been long since exploded: and it is therefore tacitly inferred, that any investigation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation on the ground of such philosophy, is out of date and must be fruitless. But the Church of Rome has not given up that philosophy. She retains it still, in her decrees, so far at least, as to distinguish between the substance and accidents or species of the elements, and to speak of the substance of the body and blood of Christ. And the philosophical apologist, Dr. Moehler, says, "that Almighty God—changes the inward substance of the consecrated bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ."*

The doctrine of Transubstantiation was not founded on this

* Symbolism, translated by J. B. Robertson, Esq., Lond. 1843, I. 334. Dr. Pusey also seems to use the terms without objection: "The Presence of Christ," pp. 16, 24, 35, 37, 41, 46.

philosophy:—if it had been founded on it, it would have gone, we must suppose, with it. But the philosophy and its terms were used merely to express, and in a way to explain, the doctrine. This doctrine assigns the mode in which the Church of Rome believes that our Lord fulfils his word and makes the bread his body and the wine his blood. This she holds is done, by putting the substance of his body into, or making it to be contained in, the elements: and this by changing them from bread and wine into his body and blood. But these elements are, to all appearance, unchanged. To our outward senses, they are the same which they were before. The change, therefore, being supposed to be real, must be in the inward invisible substance; which, consequently, has left all its outward properties, its species, or accidents, by themselves. That is to say, all that makes the elements bread and wine, and without which they could not be bread and wine, is said to be gone: and nothing remains but those outward properties which exhibit themselves to our senses.

With this explanation, then, as to substance and accidents, we proceed to deal with the question before us: and for this purpose the terms “substance and accidents,” are more convenient than any others.

The Church of Rome forbids the belief that any part of the substance of the elements remains; but allows that all the accidents or properties of the elements remain; so that while the bread and wine, or their substances, are no longer under, or in, the things, which to the outward senses are bread and wine still, the consecrated elements may be, nevertheless, called by their original names.³⁴

The Council of Trent declared that “the Catholic Church,

³⁴ “Si quis dixerit, in sacrosancto Eucharistiæ sacramento remanere substantiam panis et vini, una cum corpore et sanguine Domini nostri, Jesu Christi; negaveritque mirabilem illam et singularem conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, et totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, manentibus duntaxat speciebus panis et vini: quam quidem conversionem Catholica Ecclesia aptissime Transubstantiationem appellat, anathema sit.”—Cone. Trid. sess. 13, can. 2.

“Ipse Dominus dixit: *Hoc est corpus meum*: vocis enim, *hoc*, ea vis est, ut omnem rei presentis substantiam demonstrat: quod si panis substantia remaneret,

“If any one shall say that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine remains together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, the species only of bread and wine remaining: which conversion the Catholic Church most fitly calls Transubstantiation; let him be anathema.”

“The Lord Himself said: *This is my body*: for such is the force of the word, *this*, that it shows the whole substance of

instructed by Jesus Christ Himself, our Lord, and by his apostles, and taught by the Holy Spirit, continually suggesting to her all truth, has ever held this doctrine, and will hold it even to the end of the world." *

But, in the first place, the very name of the doctrine was not invented, as we have seen, till about the end of the eleventh century: and this fact is a strong presumptive proof, that the doctrine had not been professed or received until about that time. It would, by itself, seem to prove, that although there might have been controversy on the subject before, controversy had not advanced so far as the distinct enunciation of the doctrine. And this, in fact, was the case; for during eight hundred years, the doctrine of the Eucharist, although very variously expressed, continued, in the main, unchanged and uncontroverted. Throughout all this period, the faith of the Church on this Sacrament was preserved substantially incorrupt; though in the progress of time language of a doubtful character was more and more used by individual writers; inso-much that many passages are to be found, which, if taken by themselves, and without any regard to other places of the same writers, seem to come near the doctrine of transubstantiation. But it was not until the ninth century, that any clear and distinct approach to this doctrine was made.

Early in this century, Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of Corby, near Amiens, is stated by Bellarmine and Sismondus, to have been "the first who seriously and copiously wrote con-

nullo modo vere dici videretur: Hoc est corpus meum.

"Cum ergo, tam claris et perspicuis verbis" (S. Johan v. 52, 54, 56), "carnem suam panem et cibum verum; sanguinem item verum potum nominaverit, satis videtur declarasse nullam in Sacramento substantiam panis et vini remanere."—Cat. Conc. Trid. II. iv. 37.

"Moneant pastores hoc loco mirandum non esse, si post consecrationem panis etiam vocetur: hoc enim nomine Eucharistia appellari consuevit: tum quia panis speciem habeat, tum quia naturalem alendi et nutriendi corporis vim quæ panis propria est, adhuc retineat. Eam autem esse Sacrarum Literarum consuetudinem, ut res ita appellet, cujusmodi esse videntur, satis ostendit quod in Genesi dictum est, tres viros Abrahamæ apparuisse, qui tamen tres angeli erant."—Ibid. 38.

a present thing; but if the substance of the bread remained, it would seem to be in no way truly said, This is my body.

"Since, therefore, in so clear and plain words, He called his flesh bread and meat indeed, his blood likewise drink indeed: He seems sufficiently to have declared that no substance of bread and wine remains in this Sacrament.

"Here let the pastors warn them that they must not wonder, if it be still called bread after consecration: for by this name the Eucharist has been wont to be called; as well because it has the species of bread, as because it yet retains the natural power of sustaining and nourishing the body, which belongs to bread. That, moreover, such is the custom of Holy Scripture, that it calls things such as they appear to be, that which is said in Genesis sufficiently shows, that three men appeared to Abraham, who, however, were three angels."

* Sess. 13, c. 1.

cerning the truth of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist," and to have "so explained the genuine sense of the Catholic Church, that he opened the way to the rest, who afterwards in great numbers wrote upon the same argument."³⁵ But his doctrine met with great opposition as novel and erroneous; and his assailants suffered no reproofs from Popes or Councils, which we may be sure would have been administered, if the doctrine had been commonly received.³⁶

The doctrine of Paschasius, however, was far short of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Bishop Cosin justly says that "in that whole book of Paschasius there is nothing that favours the transubstantiation of the bread, or its destruction, or removal."* He wrote against some who held that "this bread and cup was nothing else than what is seen with the eyes and is tasted with the mouth;" and that "it is not the true flesh of Christ, nor his true blood, which is celebrated in the Sacrament, but only a certain virtue of his body and blood." And he represented such opinions as virtually imputing a lie to Christ, since they made it "not his true flesh, nor his true blood, in which his true death is shown forth; whereaſ the very Truth says, 'This is my body,' and likewise of the cup, 'Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament,' not any kind whatsoever, but that 'which shall be shed for you for the remission of sins.'"³⁷

³⁵ "Hic author primus fuit qui serio et copiose scripsit de veritate corporis et sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia contra Bertramnum presbyterum, qui fuit ex primis qui eam in dubio revocavit."—Bellarmin. De Script. Eccl. verbo "Paschasius." "Genuinum Ecclesiæ Catholicæ sensum ita primum explicuit, ut viam cæteris aperuerit qui de eodem argumento postea scripsere."—Sirmond, in Vita Radberti.

There is, however, a little misstatement in this place of Bellarmine: for Paschasius did not write his work against Bertram; but Bertram's work was written against that of Paschasius at the request of Charles the Bald.

³⁶ In "Mr. Albertin's elaborate book of the Eucharist," is to be seen "what opposition was made to the new hypothesis of Paschasius Rathbertus (which was rather a consubstantiation than a transubstantiation) as soon as it appeared, by Rabanus Maurus, Amalarius, Walafridus Strabo, Heribaldus, Lupus, Frudegardus, Joannes Erigena, Prudentius Tricassinus, Christianus Druthmarus, Alfricus, and the Saxon homilies, Fulbertus Carnotensis, Leuthericus Senonensis, Berno Augiensis, and others, to the time of Berengarius; after whom it met with greater opposition from Honorius Augustodunensis, Amalricus, Peter and Henry de Bruis, Guido Grossus, Archbishop of Narbonne, Francus Abbas, the Waldenses and Albigenses, the Bohemians, and followers of John Huss, and Jerom of Prague, the Wicklevists here in England, among whom was the famous Reginald Peacock, and many other learned men, to the time of the Reformation."—Bingham's Christ. Antiq. XV. v. 4. See Albertin., De Sacram. Euch. pp. 920, &c.; and see also L'Arroque's Hist. of the Eucharist, chapters xiii., &c.; Cosin's Hist. of Transubstantiation, v. 29, &c.

* History of Transubstantiation, v. 29.

³⁷ "In his mysticis rebus plures aliud sapiunt, et cæcutiunt multi, dum panis iste et calix nihil aliud esse videntur, quam quod oculis cernitur, et ore sentitur. Audiant qui volunt extenuare hoc verbum corporis, quod non sit vera caro Christi, quæ nunc in Sacramento celebratur in Ecclesia Christi, neque verus sanguis ejus: nescio quid volentes plaudere vel fingere, quasi virtus sit carnis et sanguinis in eo admodum

He, therefore, asserted on the contrary, that "nothing else than the flesh and blood of Christ is to be believed after the consecration" of the bread and wine:—that flesh "which was born of Mary, and suffered on the cross, and rose again from the tomb:"—that it is the "true flesh and true blood, in a mystery," which the unworthy did not receive, but, on the contrary, judgment: that "the body and blood of the Lord, according to truth, are received by faith:" that the mystery "remains in the figure of bread and wine:" that "we cannot deny that the Sacrament is a figure," while "it is at the same time rightly called truth:" and that since it behoved our Lord to penetrate the heavens, according to the "flesh, in order that they who are born again in Him might have their desire more confidently directed thither, He has left to us this visible Sacrament for a figure and image of his flesh and blood, that by these our mind and our flesh may be more fruitfully nourished to lay hold of invisible and spiritual things by faith." And he thus illustrates the sense in which he asserted both figure and truth in the Sacrament:³⁸ citing Heb. i. 3, he says

sacramento, ut Dominus mentiatur, ut non sit vera caro ejus, neque verus sanguis, in quibus vera mors Christi annuntiatur, cum ipsa Veritas dicat, 'Hoc est corpus meum,' &c.—Expositio in Matth. xxvi. ; Migne, pp. 896, 890, vel. 1100, 1093.

"Et ideo nullus moveatur de hoc corpore Christi et sanguine, quod in mysterio vera sit caro et verus sit sanguis, dum sic voluit ille qui creavit:—et quia voluit, licet in figura panis et vini maneat, hæc sic esse omnino, nihilque aliud quam caro Christi et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt: et ut mirabilius loquar, non alia plane quam quæ nata est de Maria et passa in cruce, et resurrexit de sepulcro."—De Corp. et Sang. Domini, I. ii. ; Migne, p. 1269. "Alius carnem Christi spiritaliter manducat et sanguinem bibit, alius vero non, quamvis buccellam de manu sacerdotis videatur percipere. Et quid accipit, cum una sit consecratio, si corpus et sanguinem Christi non accipit? vere, quia rem indigne accipit, sicut Paulus apostolus ait: Judicium sibi manducat et bibit."—VI. ii. 1282. "Corpus et sanguis sit Domini secundum veritatem, licet in Sacramento accipiatur per fidem."—II. ii. "Quia mysticum est Sacramentum, nec figuram illud negare possumus.—Si veraciter inspicimus, jure simul veritas et figura dicitur.—Sed quia illud secundum carnem cælos oportuit penetrare, ut per fidem illuc in illo renati, confidentius appeterent, reliquit nobis hoc sacramentum visibile in figuram et characterem carnis et sanguinis, ut per hæc mens nostra et caro nostra ad invisibilia et spiritalia capessenda per fidem uberius nutriatur."—IV. i. ii. 1278, 1279.

³⁸ "Quibus profecto verbis duas in Christo substantias dedecit, et utrasque veras. Nam cum dicit, 'qui cum sit splendor gloriæ' divinitatis, consubstantialiæ prædicat. Cum vero figura vel character substantiæ ejus, humanitatis designat naturam, ubi corporaliter plenitudo inhabitat Divinitatis, et tamen in utroque unus et verus Christus Deus catholice commendatur. Unde unam rem sumit ad demonstrationem duarum substantiarum, quam figuram substantiæ vel characterem nominavit: quia sicut per characteres vel figuras literarum infantia nostra prius pertingit gradatim ad lectionem, deinde ad spirituales Scripturarum sensus et intelligentiam; sic ex humanitate Christi, ad Divinitatem Patris pervenitur; et ideo jure figura vel character substantiæ illius vocatur. Quid enim aliud sunt figure literarum quam characteres earundem, ut per eas vis et potestas, ac spiritus prolatio oculis demonstratur? Sic itaque formatur Verbum caro, ut per carnem nostra infantia ad divinitatis intelligentiam nutriatur. Veruntamen neque characteres literarum, falsitas, neque aliud quam literæ: neque Christus homo falsitas dici potest, neque aliud quam Deus, licet figura, id est, character substantiæ, Divinitatis jure dicatur."—IV. ii. 1278, 1279.

that, "in these words the apostle sets forth two substances in Christ, and both of them true. For when he says, 'who, being the brightness of the glory' of the Divinity, he declares Him to be consubstantial. But when he says 'the figure or image of his substance,' he designates the nature of his humanity, where the fulness of the Divinity dwells bodily, and yet in both [forms of words], the one and true Christ God is celebrated in accordance with Catholic truth. Whence he takes one thing for the demonstration of two substances, which he called the figure or image of the substance: because, as by images or figures of letters our childhood first gets on gradually to reading, and then to the spiritual senses and intelligence of the Scriptures; so from the humanity of Christ we come to the Divinity of the Father: and, therefore, He is rightly called the figure or image of his substance.—Neither may the man Christ be called an untruth, nor any other than God, although He be rightly called a figure, that is, an image of the substance of the Divinity."

It follows, therefore, that Paschasius, in calling the Sacrament of the Eucharist both a figure and the truth, intended to set forth two substances, the substance of the bread and wine, and the true flesh and the true blood of Christ. And, on the one hand, however literally he may assert the true flesh and the true blood of Christ in the Sacrament, he does not teach what is called the real presence of that flesh and blood in or with the elements; but that the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ, the true body and blood: a distinction the importance of which will be seen in another place: while, on the other hand, he teaches no transubstantiation of the elements, no change or annihilation of their substance.

Paschasius, however, in insisting upon the letter of our Lord's words, overlooked the fact that he was taking only part of the letter; and failed to see that the whole would have led him by the same system of interpretation to another and sounder doctrine.

Many writers succeeded Paschasius in the endeavour to elucidate the true doctrine of the Eucharist; some taking one side, and some the other in the controversy which he had provoked. But it was a long time before the doctrine of Transubstantiation was actually hammered out. The reader may see the whole history set forth in Hospinian, Albertin, L'Arroque, or Cosin.

About two hundred years after Paschasius, Berengarius incurred the censures of Rome for his doctrine of the Eucharist. He was condemned by several successive Councils, and was obliged to sign a recantation, and to say that "the bread and wine which are set on the altar are not, after the consecration, a sacrament only, but also the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that [the body and blood] are sensibly, not only in a sacrament, but in truth, handled by the hands of the priests, broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful."³⁹

This was a grosser form of doctrine than that of Paschasius, who said that "it is not right [or possible] that Christ should be devoured by men's teeth."⁴⁰ Yet it did not amount to Transubstantiation, though it was the authorised doctrine of Rome in the middle of the eleventh century.

But having retracted this recantation, and continuing to defend and propagate his doctrine, Berengarius was summoned to another Council, and by it was compelled to sign another form, in which it was professed that "that mystical bread is substantially converted into the true and proper flesh of Christ:"⁴¹ an advance, certainly, beyond his previous recantation, but still not amounting to Transubstantiation. For it did not assert a conversion of the substance of the bread into the substance of our Lord's flesh, though a substantial conversion may seem to be equivalent: nor did it assert a residuum of the species or accidents only.

The philosophy of the time, however, culminated at length, about one hundred and fifty years after Berengarius; the Council of Lateran, in the year of our Lord 1215, having issued a decree imposing the doctrine of Transubstantiation as an article of faith.

Now this doctrine of Transubstantiation comprises these three things: first, a change in the bread and wine, by which their proper substance is taken away, and their accidents are left subsisting together by themselves: secondly, a change of their whole substance into the whole substance of the body and

³⁹ "Panem et vinum, quæ in altare ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, et sensualiter, non solum sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri."—Hospinian. *Hist. Sacram.* IV. iii. vol. i. 338.

⁴⁰ "Christum vorari fas dentibus non est."—IV. i. 1277.

⁴¹ "Panem illum mysticum substantialiter converti in veram et propriam carnem Christi."—Tho. Waldens. tom. ii. c. 42; ["De Sacram. Euch. c. 42, 43"] cited in Cosin, vii. 12, Oxford, iv. 121.

blood of Christ: and thirdly, the real presence of Christ under the species of the bread and wine.

We must consider each in its order.

I. The first question is whether, according to the constitution of earthly things, a material substance can be separated from all its accidents or properties, and whether the accidents can be left as if the substance still remained to support them.

Now this is a phenomenon of which human experience affords no example, and human imagination can have no conception. No man has ever yet known, or can conceive, such a change as that in which, as Archbishop Cranmer says, "there remaineth whiteness, but nothing is white: there remaineth colours, but nothing is coloured therewith: there remaineth roundness, but nothing is round: and there is bigness, and yet nothing is big: there is sweetness, without any sweet thing; softness, without any soft thing; breaking, without anything broken; division, without anything divided: and so other qualities and quantities, without anything to receive them."* There is not one fact ascertained by the experience of man from the creation until now, which can afford an example of such a change: there is not one valid argument which the subtlest speculations have ever produced to prove its possibility: there is not a word from the beginning to the end of the Bible from which it may be believed, that the properties, or, if you please, the accidents of a thing can subsist of themselves when the substance is gone.

Bellarmino, indeed, cites St. Basil as saying "that the light of the sun was created on the first day, and remained without a seat or vehicle for three days, and at length, on the fourth day, the solar body was created, and in it, as in a subject, was placed that light which had been created on the first day." But, in the first place, without questioning the genuineness of this quotation, there are several obvious inaccuracies in it. The inspired history does not say that on the first day, when the Spirit of God was moving "on the face of the waters," God created light. He said, "Let there be light, and there was light." He called it forth. And there may be a very pregnant distinction in this. Light may have been in existence millions of years before the earth was being brought into "form," and its "void" filled up. For many millions of years stars may have been giving light; and the summons of light to the earth may have been, not the creation of light, but the admission of light

* On the Lord's Supper, i. 43, p. 45, Parker Society's edition.

to the earth by a medium instituted by that command. Nor does the Scripture say that the light which God called forth upon the earth on the first day, was the light of the sun : nor that the light of that day "remained without a seat or vehicle for three days : " nor that this light was placed in the sun, "as in a subject."

In the second place light is either a substance or an accident. If it be a substance, then the argument fails : for the addition of one substance to another cannot prove that a substance and its accidents can exist separately from each other. If the corpuscular be the true theory of light, light consists of particles of matter emitted from the luminaries of heaven, and is an ever-emanating portion of their substance. But if the undulatory theory, which seems to meet all the known phenomena of light, be the true theory, it is certainly an accident, or an effect of which the sun is but one of many causes, though it be the chief cause to us : and the sun, instead of having the light laid up in it, has merely the power of exciting light. And as there is no effect without a cause, the undulations of the ether, of which light consists, must have been excited in the atmosphere of the earth by some other power than that of the sun, which was not yet made. What that power may have been, we know not : for, according to the account in Genesis, the sun being not yet made ; and the earth, therefore, having not yet begun her circuit round him ; it is impossible to determine by what means or power of created things the waves of the ether were in the meantime originated or sustained, in order to produce light.

It does, therefore, not follow from the creation of light or bringing it to the earth, before the creation of the sun, that accidents can subsist without their proper substance.

Universal and invariable experience, on the contrary, teaches that where all, and only all, of the properties or accidents of any substance exist together, there is that substance itself. So does nature, so does logic, so does true theology, teach. It is an axiom which no one ever doubts, and on which we unceasingly act. If, for example, a man, having to pay a debt, puts down a certain substance, which has the colour, the shape, the weight, the size, and the exact impression, of a sovereign ; the creditor is perfectly satisfied that it is the genuine and lawful coin of the realm, and accepts it in discharge of the debt ; although neither debtor nor creditor knows anything of

the substance of the coin, more than we know of the substance of the bread and wine. So in all the affairs of life, physical and moral. It is on the certainty of this truth, that we take our daily meals. If the chemist find that the subject of his analysis has all, and no more than all, the properties of some known substance, he instantly pronounces it to be the same. Give also the mathematician certain elements, and he will infallibly pronounce that the figure which has them, is a circle, a square, or a triangle, as the case may be: for that which has all the properties of a circle, is a circle, and cannot be anything else.

Nor is it in things of this lower world only, that the rule holds good. We apply it to the Highest of all, the Lord of heaven and earth. It is only by his attributes, and by revelations from Him, that we know God: and we consider that one of the strongest proofs of the Godhead of Christ, is his having all the attributes or perfections of God. He is almighty, omniscient, omnipresent, eternal: He has all the perfections of God, and therefore is God.

We prove, too, that He is man, because He had the properties of man. We prove that He is truly man,—“come in the flesh,” as St. John speaks, when we show that He was born as a man of the Virgin Mary; that He had the form of a man; that He “increased in wisdom, and stature” as a man; that He ate and drank; spoke, heard, and saw; lay down and rose up; walked and was weary; slept and awoke; wept and was angry; suffered and died,—as a man. From his having these and all other essential properties, or “accidents” of man’s nature,—from the action and passion of these things,—we are infallibly certain, that He had man’s nature and substance.

And for this mode of proof we have his own warrant and example: as in those places, where from doing the works, and manifesting the power, of God, He taught the Jews to infer that He is God.

To speak, indeed, of accidents being separated from their substance, and subsisting of themselves without it, is only to substitute words for things. But though we can talk of them separately, and as if they were separable, we cannot conceive such a separation of accidents from their substance as this doctrine involves.

Almighty power, most certainly, can annihilate, as well as create, a substance: for all created substances were made out of nothing; and the power which made them can reduce them to nothing again. But so long as the substance exists, it will

retain the properties inseparable from all material things : it must have its accidents or properties, according to its state : for otherwise it would be no substance :—that is to say, that so long as it is a substance, it must be a substance. And if the substance be destroyed, its accidents,—all that belonged to it,—are *ipso facto* destroyed likewise ; or else they would become substances themselves, which is absurd. As Leslie argues, “ They cannot be accidents of bread, when there is no bread : and you will not endure that they should be called the accidents of the body and blood of Christ : Therefore they are the accidents of nothing, that is, they are accidents, and no accidents : they are accidents without the essence of accidents, which is inherence. And if these accidents stand by themselves, why are they not substances ? for that is the definition you give of substance. If you say they stand by miracle, then by miracle they are substances : and there is an end of the jargon.” *

Nothing, indeed, but the very plainest and most incontrovertible assurance from God could give credibility to the subsistence, either separately or together, of the properties or accidents of any material substance, when the substance itself was taken away.

I cannot find that that very subtle theologian, Aquinas, made any attempt in his “ Summa ” to prove that a material substance could be separated from its proper accidents, or from the accidents which belong to all material substances in whatsoever condition they might be ; or, which is yet more important to the present enquiry, that the accidents of any material substance can subsist together without their proper substance, or any substance to support them : that the texture, the colour, the size, the taste, of bread, with its power of nourishing, can subsist together, and be bread to all intents and purposes for which bread is used, when the substance of the bread itself was taken away.

Aquinas, on the contrary, deduces this amazing proposition from his doctrine of Transubstantiation, instead of proving the doctrine by it. He argues that the true body and blood of Christ are in the Sacrament ; that his body cannot begin to be in it but by the conversion of the substance of the bread into it : that the words, “ This is my body ” would not be true, if the substance of the bread remained there ; that therefore it must

* The Case stated between the Churches of England and Rome. Works, London, 1721, I. 520.

be confessed that the substance of the bread and wine does not remain in the Sacrament: and that therefore, as is evident to our senses, all the accidents of the bread and wine remain after consecration, not indeed according to the order of nature, which requires accidents to be in their subject; but for a special reason according to the order of grace.⁴²

Thus the argumentation of Aquinas comes to this: that accidents are not without their substance in any case except this one only of the Eucharist; but in this case they are and therefore may be, and may subsist together, without it.

Bellarmino and others handle the abstract question: but I cannot report of their disquisitions, that they are anything better than a mere jargon of metaphysics and a play upon words. A summary of the arguments on both sides, with testimonies from ancient philosophers and Fathers in opposition to this doctrine of the Schoolmen, will be found in the work of Albertinus on the Sacrament of the Eucharist.*

But what is the fact? Is the substance of the bread and wine in the Eucharist so converted as to be taken away from the accidents? are their accidents left subsisting together by themselves? And how is the fact to be determined?

First, then, we know that the things which are set forth for consecration are truly bread and wine. We are absolutely sure that they are bread and wine. But whence come this knowledge and certainty? They come from our senses alone. We are commanded to take bread and wine, and we obey the command. We are careful to take that which is commanded: and we use our senses for this purpose. But after the consecration of the bread and wine, there are the very same reasons for calling them and believing them to be, bread and wine, as there were before. We have precisely the very same evidence, the same means, and the same powers, to determine that they are bread and wine. Before consecration they looked like bread

⁴² "Dicendum quod verum corpus Christi et sanguinem esse in hoc sacramento." 3a. q. 75, i. c. "Cum Christi corpus non possit incipere esse in Eucharistia nisi per conversionem substantiæ panis in ipsum, panis et vini substantiam in hoc sacramento non permanere fatendum est."—Ibid. art. 2, c. "Dicitur, 'hoc est corpus meum;' quod non esset verum; si substantia panis ibi remaneret, nunquam enim substantia panis est corpus Christi."—Ibid. "Dicendum quod sensu apparet, facta consecratione, omnia accidentia panis et vini remanere."—Art. 5, c. "Et ita etiam licet sit secundum communem naturæ ordinem, quod accidens sit in subjecto, ex speciali tamen ratione secundum ordinem gratiæ, accidentia sunt in hoc sacramento sine subjecto."—q. 77, i. c. 1m.

* I. xx. p. 125.

and wine, and we judged that they were what they appeared to be; and if there had been any doubt, the taste would have instantly determined the question. And after consecration they still look as much like bread and wine; they feel, smell, and taste as much like bread and wine as before. Let them be tried and examined in any way; and if we know, or can be sure, of anything, we must know and be sure, that they are bread and wine as much and as really as they were before. As surely as we know they were bread and wine before consecration, so surely do we know that they are bread and wine after consecration. To these four senses, moreover, we must add the fifth; * for we hear from several places of Scripture, especially from St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, that that which we break and eat is bread, and that which we drink is the cup or wine. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?—As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." And then he speaks a very awful warning that none should eat "this bread and drink this cup unworthily." † The apostle thus calls them bread and wine after consecration as well as before.

To all our senses, therefore, the elements of the Eucharist are no less bread and wine after consecration, than they were before; and if to all our senses, then to all our understanding; and since "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," then also, to our faith, they are precisely the same. We must know and believe that no such change takes place in the elements of the Eucharist, as the removal of their substance, and the subsisting of their accidents together by themselves alone: and that being bread and wine before consecration, they are bread and wine after consecration, in every sense, and as much as they were before it.

It must, certainly, be admitted, that every one of our senses may be disordered, and therefore deceived. We know that the taste is sometimes so vitiated as to mistake sweet for bitter: that there are people who cannot distinguish one colour from another. And all the rest of our senses may be similarly disordered or incapable. It may be said, too, that they may be deceived even when they are perfect: as the sight, by mistaking ice for glass, or glass for precious stones, or the mirage of the

* 2 Kings xix. 16.

† 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 26-29.

desert for water: or again, as the hearing, by mistaking distant noises for thunder, or the voice of a parrot for that of a man. But the deception in such cases is not of the senses. Their perception is true and accurate: and the mistake is only in our judgment. We see a pellucid substance, and conclude that it is glass, or a diamond: the mirage is like water, and we conclude it is water: we hear a noise like that of thunder, and conclude that it is thunder: and we hear a voice speaking like man's voice, and conclude that it is a man who uttered it.

But certain as it is, that one or more of the senses of some men may be disordered, or even, in a way, deceived; it cannot be pretended that the senses of all men, everywhere, and always, have been, or can be, deceived about the same thing. Yet the argument from the imperfection of the senses, or the possibility of their being disordered or deceived necessarily involves this proposition. It would have no force without it.

We may, indeed, allow that where one man sees what another with the same opportunities does not see; there may be room for doubt, or for further enquiry. One may be near-sighted, or blind; or the other, like St. Stephen and St. Paul, may be permitted to see what the mere natural sight cannot perceive. But where all men see alike, there can be no doubt or uncertainty as to what they do see. And where all, everywhere and always, not only see, but taste and feel alike, there must be absolute certainty, if anything can be certain to us. But in the case of the holy Eucharist, the senses of all men, everywhere and always, are in perfect harmony. All see alike; none see less, none more, none differently, from others. One sense confirms another: the feeling confirms the sight, and the taste confirms both. All see, feel, and taste bread, whether it be consecrated or unconsecrated. And if, by any chance, consecrated and unconsecrated wafers were to be mixed together, no human authority, not even the pretended infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, could detect the difference.

Romanists, indeed, confess that there are all the properties,—which they call accidents, of bread, in the consecrated host: and that it may even be called bread. They trust their senses so far, as to be sure that the thing which they take for consecration, is bread: and so far also, as to determine that all the accidents of the bread remain after consecration. The great catechism of Rome says that it is one of the “three things,

maxime admiranda atque suspicienda,—to be most admired and looked up to,” in this Sacrament, “that the accidents, which are either perceived by the eyes, or are apprehended by other senses, remain without the substance.”* They declare that the colour, shape, smell, taste, and all other accidents or properties of the bread and wine remain: while they deny that the substance remains. In point of fact, therefore, it is not the senses nor the evidence, which is discredited, but it is the inference from that evidence,—the conclusion to be drawn from the premisses which the senses establish. It is denied that the things which are bread and wine to the sight, the touch, and the taste, are bread and wine any longer: and this, although it was determined by the same means, and for the same reasons, that they were most certainly bread and wine before they were consecrated.

Bellarmino (De Euch. III. 24) admits that the senses cannot be deceived about their proper objects: but he argues that the accidents of a thing only are their proper object, and not the substance; which he says, is not an object of the senses, but by its accidents. But if this applies to the consecrated elements, it applies equally to the unconsecrated: so that one can with no more certainty say of the unconsecrated, that it is bread, than of the consecrated. They can have no more certainty that they take bread for consecration, than that it is bread after consecration. If it be bread before consecration, it is, as certainly and for the self-same reasons, bread after consecration. They must have bread, for this is commanded: and they can be sure that they have bread, only from the accidents: and the accidents tell the same thing after, as well as before, consecration. The accidents are the same: and from the same accidents we must judge that there is the same substance, as infallibly as logicians must draw the same conclusions from the same premisses, or arithmeticians with the same numbers must make up the same sum.

If the senses are deceived in the consecrated host, they are deceived in the unconsecrated: and if it be not bread after consecration, they cannot be sure that it is that which they are commanded to consecrate. The accidents tell the same thing, at the end as at the beginning of the Liturgy: they are not less reliable and the conclusion is not less certain, at the one time than at the other: if it was bread before consecration, it is

* Cat. Conc. Trid. II. iv. 25. See also Conc. Trid. sess. 13, c. 1.

bread after consecration, if we are not to take leave of our senses and reason together, and make faith impossible.

And again, the substance of all material things must be material: or else we must come to the original nothing out of which they were created. To resolve any material body into its ultimate elements may, I suppose, be considered to be beyond all human power: to annihilate it, or reduce it to its original nothingness, is in the power of God alone. But it is in the power of man to reduce all or most material things which he can reach, into very simple elements, which he can weigh and measure, see and feel, taste and smell. And if, as Sir Humphrey Davy said, they "may perhaps ultimately be resolved into still fewer elements," and found at length, to "be different forms of the same material:"* yet even then, so long as the material thing exists in any condition, it is amenable to the human senses. A material body or thing must have a material substance: and this substance must be more than a metaphysical quiddity: if the substance be material, it must ultimately, pursue it as far as we may, be an object of the senses, and cognisable by them.

Now let the bread and wine be taken, and submitted to any process known or conceivable by the most experienced analyst; let them be desiccated, or burnt, or treated by any chemical agent whatsoever: a residuum will still be found, which can be weighed or measured, seen, felt, tasted, and smelt. And there will be no difference in the result, whether the bread and wine be consecrated or unconsecrated. The very same results precisely will be obtained from the consecrated and unconsecrated elements. But these results, the mere accidents of bread and wine, alone, never could yield, or even be conceived to yield. Their substance will be found still remaining.

If, then, the consecrated bread and wine will ultimately yield some material substance cognisable by the senses; and if their accidents alone could not yield this result: the substance of the bread and wine still remains, and their accidents do not subsist together without it.

But here some Romanists may say that they have a ready answer. They will assert that as soon as ever the analyst lays his hands upon the host and chalice, the body and blood of Christ depart, and the substance of the bread and wine returns. And a complete answer, certainly, it would be, if it were true. But this is a mere invention and subterfuge of the rationalism which

* Elements of Chemical Philosophy, p. 503.

pervades the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and its ramifications.

Nor have the theologians of Rome been of one mind on this point. Aquinas, for example, thought such a supposition erroneous, derogatory to the truth of the Sacrament, and a diminution of the dignity of Christ's body.⁴³

Of substance, abstract substance, metaphysical substance, we certainly can have no idea. We can imagine that there is or may be such a thing, an universal, homogeneous simple thing, the basis of all material entities: and we can go no further. But of the concrete, actual substances of bread and wine, we can and do have a perfectly true idea and perception, when we eat and drink them.

To our sight, to our feeling, our taste, and our smelling,—in short, to all our senses, the elements of bread and wine receive consecration in the Eucharist without change in themselves: the senses of all before whom they are placed give the same testimony: and universal reason delivers the same verdict.

⁴³ "Circa hoc quidam antiqui erraverunt, dicentes, quod corpus Christi nec etiam sacramentaliter a peccatoribus sumitur, sed quam cito labiis peccatoris contingitur, tam cito sub speciebus sacramentalibus desinit esse corpus Christi. Sed hoc est erroneum: derogat enim veritati hujus sacramenti, ad quam pertinet quod manentibus speciebus corpus Christi sub eis esse non desinat. Species autem manent, quamdiu substantia panis maneret, si adesset. Manifestum autem est quod substantia panis assumpta a peccatore, non statim esse desinit, sed manet quamdiu per calorem naturalem digeratur. Unde tamdiu corpus Christi sub speciebus sacramentalibus manet a peccatoribus sumptis. Unde dicendum est quod peccator sacramentaliter corpus Christi manducare potest, et non solum justus. Dicendum quod si mus vel canis hostiam consecratam manducet, substantia corporis Christi non desinit esse sub speciebus, quamdiu species illæ manent. Nec hoc vergit in detrimentum dignitatis corporis Christi, qui voluit a peccatoribus crucifigi absque diminutione suæ dignitatis: præsertim cum mus aut canis non tangat ipsum corpus Christi, secundum propriam speciem, sed solum secundum species sacramentales. Quidam autem dixerunt, quod statim cum sacramentum tangitur a mure vel cane, desinit ibi esse corpus Christi. Quod etiam derogat veritati sacramenti."—II. lxxx. 2 and 3.

"Those ancients have erred, who say that the body of Christ is not even sacramentally taken by sinners, but that, as soon as ever it is touched by the lips of a sinner, the body of Christ ceases to be under the sacramental species. But this is erroneous, for it derogates from the truth of this Sacrament, to which it pertains, that while the species remain, the body of Christ ceases not to be under them. Now the species remain as long as the substance of bread would remain, if it were present there. But it is manifest that the substance of [common] bread taken by sinners does not immediately cease to be, but remains until it be digested by natural heat. Hence the body of Christ remains so long under the species that are taken by sinners. We must therefore say that a sinner can sacramentally eat the body of Christ, and not the just only." Nay, "if even a mouse or a dog eat the consecrated host, the body of Christ does not cease to be under the species, so long as those species remain. Nor does this approach to a lessening of the dignity of the body of Christ, who willed to be crucified by sinners, without diminution of his dignity: particularly when a mouse or a dog cannot touch the body of Christ itself according to its proper species, but only according to the sacramental species. But some have said that immediately when the sacrament is touched by a mouse or a dog, the body of Christ ceases to be there, which also derogates from the truth of the Sacrament."

Are we then to receive or to reject this verdict? In all other like matters, such a decision, on such grounds, and by such means, would be accepted without doubt or hesitation, and would be implicitly allowed to rule our conduct. We continually act upon the evidence of our senses, and the conclusions of our reason from it, in the affairs of everyday life.

In matters of infinitely higher moment, our Lord Himself appealed to our natural judgment, and required its exercise; when He asked: "why even of your own selves judge ye not what is right?"* And when He refuted the Saducees, by proving the resurrection from the Books of Moses; and silenced the Pharisees by his question: "if David then call Christ his Lord, how is He his Son?"† He set an example of reasoning upon some of the highest points of faith, and of finding them out, and drawing them out, by reasoning.

His miracles were reasons, first to be apprehended by the senses, and then to be applied by the judgment, in proof of his Divine mission. They were appeals to the senses, and by direct consequence, are attestations of their authority.

He ordained his apostles also, "that they should be with Him," to see and to hear the things which He was to do and speak: and they, in due time, were "his witnesses unto the people,"‡ declaring "the things which they had seen and heard, and which their hands had handled of the Word of life."§

In particular, read the accounts of the resurrection, and mark how entirely its proofs depend on the credibility of the senses, especially of that sense, which the patrons of Transubstantiation would have us distrust most of all. Some *saw* the place where the Lord had lain, and that He was not there. Others *saw* the linen clothes lying, and the napkin that had been about his head. He Himself also *appeared* to them: and said, "*Behold* my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: *handle* me, and *see*; for a Spirit hath not flesh and bones, *as ye see me have*."|| Some who had not seen Him, He afterwards "upbraided with their unbelief and hardness of heart," because they believed not them which *had* seen Him after He was risen."¶ He ate and drank with the eleven:** and He was *seen* of his disciples many days.†† And these things are called *infallible proofs*:—"He shewed Himself," says St. Luke, "alive after his

* Luke xii. 57.

§ Acts iv. 20; 1 John i. 1-3.

** Luke xxiv. 43; Acts x. 3.

† Matt. xxii. 31, 32, 45.

|| Luke xxiv. 39.

†† Acts xiii. 30, 31.

‡ Acts xiii. 31.

¶ Mark xvi. 14.

passion by many infallible proofs,⁴⁴ *being seen* of the apostles forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.”*

Observe also with what confidence, and with how “great power, the apostles gave witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus :” †—what perils they braved, because they could “not but speak the things which they had seen and heard :” ‡—and how they founded their preaching on the fact of the resurrection of Jesus, and held out the assurance of forgiveness and grace to men. §

Now we believe in the resurrection of Christ, from the testimony of those “which from the beginning were his eye-witnesses and ministers,” || and “who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead.” ¶ They knew that He had died, and was buried : He showed Himself to them alive again, and they knew that it was He Himself. They *saw* and *believed*. They gave up this world, and staked their hopes of the next, on the *certainty of their sight*. We hear their testimony, and therefore also believe. And so, we build our faith on the evidence of their senses. *They saw : we believe :* and our faith rests on their *sight*.

Let us remember how much this comprises. St. Paul says : “If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain : ye are yet in your sins.”** If Christ be not risen, we cannot be raised with Him either from sin here, or from corruption hereafter. On the resurrection of Christ, then, depend our faith, our hope, and our love. It is the foundation of the Christian doctrine, and the argument of the Christian life :—it is its reason, its type, and its earnest.

If, then, we are to use the senses and the reason which God has given us, not only in the common affairs of life, but also in matters pertaining to righteousness and faith :—if we are taught to “hear and understand,” †† to go on from faith to faith, ††† “comparing spiritual things with spiritual,” §§ and thus to reach so high as even to the “great mystery of godliness :” ||||—if it has been the order of the Divine economy from the beginning,

⁴⁴ τεκμηρίοις, i.e. σημεῖα ἀναγκαῖα, Arist. *Rhet.* I. 2, 40. Signa necessaria. Quintil. Inst. V. 9, 3. Notes on the Four Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles. Pickering, 1838 ; a work, in which a mass of most valuable information, the fruits of very learned research, is condensed into the smallest space.

* Acts i. 2.

† Acts iv. 33 ; ii. 32 ; iii. 15 ; v. 29-32 ; x. 39-43.

‡ Ibid. iv. 20.

§ Ibid. iii. 26 ; v. 31 ; x. 40-43.

|| Luke i. 2.

¶ Acts x. 41.

** 1 Cor. xv. 17.

†† Matt. xv. 10.

††† John x'v. 1.

§§ 1 Cor. ii. 13.

|||| Matt. xxii. 22, 42-45 ; 1 Tim. iii. 16.

that from things seen, men were to believe the things heard, and ascend to the faith of things unseen :—if, more especially, it was from seeing, or from the report of those who were chosen to see, the works of Christ, that men were to believe his word : * —yet more, if our faith be vain, unless Christ be risen ; if our belief of his resurrection depend on the testimony of those who saw Him after He had risen ; and thus the whole fabric of our faith and hope stand upon the evidence of sense :—if the dispensations of heaven have made it our duty thus to use our senses and understanding, and have also given so strong attestations of their certainty and their authority over us ; and if, accordingly, we do use them in all other things which come within their reach :—why should we discredit and reject them in this one thing ? If the apostles had so much confidence,—if we, “with all the whole Church” of Christ, have so much confidence,—in *their* sight ; why may we not have confidence in *our own* ? If we cannot trust our own senses, how can we trust to theirs, or believe their report, which is founded upon them ? If the apostles believed, and were sure of what they saw ; we may believe, and be sure of what we see ; and may trust our senses and understanding, so much, at least, as not to go in direct opposition to them.

Our right, indeed, to judge is demonstrated by the conduct of those who would deny it. They “dispute and urge arguments,—they cite councils and fathers,—they allege Scripture and tradition.” All this would be fruitless, if we were not to judge : “and if we must judge, then we must use” and depend upon “our reason :” but “if we must not judge, why do they produce evidence ?” If they decree the thing as by infallible authority, “we may choose whether we will believe them or no : or if they say we must believe them, they must prove it, and tell us why. But all these coming into question, submit themselves to reason ; that is, to be judged by human understanding. So that Scripture, tradition, councils, and fathers are the evidence in a question, but reason is the judge.” †

“That which is one of the firmest pillars,” says the same author, “upon which all human notices, and upon which all Christian religion does rely, cannot be shaken ; or if it be, all science and all religion must be in danger.” “St. John hath placed the whole religion of a Christian upon the certainty and evidence of sense, as upon one most unmoveable foundation.” ‡

* John x. 37, 38.

† Bishop Jer. Taylor, Liberty of Prophesying, sect. 10.

‡ 1 John i. 1–3.

And again: "Faith comes by hearing, and evidence by seeing; and if a man in his wits and in his health can be deceived in these things, how can we come to believe?—For if a man or an angel declares God's will to us, if we may not trust our hearing, we cannot trust him: for we know not whether, indeed, he says what we think he says; and if God confirms the proposition by a miracle, an ocular demonstration, we are never the nearer to believing him, because our eyes are not to be trusted. But if feeling also may be abused, when a man is, in all other capacities, perfectly healthy, then he must be governed by chance, and walk in the dark, and live upon shadows, and converse with phantoms and illusions, as it happens; and then at last it will come to be doubted, whether there be any such man as himself, and whether he be awake when he is awake, or not rather, then only awake when he himself and all the world thinks him to have been asleep."*

The argument of Tertullian⁴⁴ is unanswerable. "What art thou doing, O most extravagant academician? Thou overturnest the whole state of life; thou disturbest all the order of nature; thou makest blind the providence of God Himself, [as if] He has set the senses over all His works, to be deceitful and lying guides, in understanding, inhabiting, dispensing, and enjoying them. Is not our whole condition regulated by our senses? Is it not by their means that a second order, also, has come upon the world; so many arts, so many inventions, so many pursuits, occupations, duties, dealings, remedies, councils, comforts, manners of life, improvements, embellishments?—all these have produced the whole relish of life: while by these senses man alone of all is distinguished as a rational animal, capable of understanding and knowledge, and of [the studies of] the Academy itself. We may not bring into doubt those senses, lest there be a question of their certainty even in Christ.† Lest it may perhaps be said, that He did not in truth behold Satan cast down from heaven: or

* On the Real Presence, sect. x. 1. Works (Heber), X. i. 3.

⁴⁴ "Quid agis, procacissime academicæ? Totum vitæ statum evertis, omnem naturæ ordinem turbas, ipsius Dei providentiam exæceas, qui cunctis suis operibus intelligendis, incolendis, dispensandis, fruendisque fallaces et mendaces dominos præfecerit sensus. An non istis universa conditio subministratur? An non per istos secunda quoque mundo instructio accessit, tot artes, tot ingenia, tot studia, negotia, officia, commercia, remedia, consilia, solatia, victus, cultus, ornatusque? omnia totum vitæ saporem condiderunt, dum per hos sensus solus omnium homo animal rationale dignoscitur, intelligentiæ et scientiæ capax, et ipsius Academiæ."

† That is, whether the bodily senses of Christ Himself were to be trusted: and whether his sight, his hearing, his feeling, his smelling, and his taste, were not all deceived.

did not in truth hear the voice of the Father which testified of Him: or that He was deceived, when He touched the mother-in-law of Peter: or perceived afterward a different odour of the ointment, which He accepted for His burial: or another taste afterward of the wine, which He consecrated for the memorial of His blood. For thus also Marcion preferred to believe Him a phantom, disowning the truth of the whole body in it. But not even in His apostles was nature deceived. Faithful was both sight and hearing in the Mount: faithful also the tasting of that wine, although water before, at the marriage in Galilee: faithful also the touch of the thenceforth believing Thomas. Recite the testimony of John: 'That which we have seen,' he says, 'which we have heard, seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled, of the word of life.' False, certainly, is the testimony, if nature deceives the senses of eyes, and ears, and hands."⁴⁵

Yet, when we thus demonstrate the certainty with which our senses show, and our reason determines, that the substances of the elements are not taken away from their accidents; and the necessity of our believing that which our senses and reason so determine; we must not be understood as intending to infer that the bread and wine are nothing more after consecration than they were before. Faith has its province, as well as sense and reason. We are not required to disbelieve what we see and know: but there are things which we do not see, and yet must believe. And while we see and know that the consecrated elements are still bread and wine, we must believe faithfully the words of Christ Himself, that they are, nevertheless, his body and blood. As, when we prove that He is indeed "perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting;" we do not raise the least impediment to the doctrine, that He is also "perfect God:" so the proof that the consecrated elements are bread and wine, nay, that they are not his

⁴⁵ "Non licet nobis in dubium sensus istos devocare, ne et in Christo de fide eorum deliberetur. Ne forte dicatur, quod falso Satanam prospectarit de cœlo præcipitatum: aut falso vocem Patris audierit de ipso testificatam: aut deceptus sit, quum Petri sorum tetigit: aut alium postea unguenti senserit spiritum, quod in sepulturam suam acceptavit: alium postea vini saporem, quod in sanguinis sui memoriam consecravit. Sic enim et Marcion phantasma eum maluit credere, totius corporis in illo dedignatus veritatem. Atquin ne in apostolis quidem ejus ludificata natura est. Fidelis fuit et visus et auditus in monte: fidelis et gustus vini illius, licet aquæ ante, in nuptiis Galilææ: fidelis et tactus, exiude creduli Thomæ. Recita Joannis testimonium: 'Quod vidimus,' inquit, 'quod andivimus, oculis nostris vidimus, et manus nostræ contractaverunt, de sermone vitæ.' Falsa utique testatio, si oculorum et aurium et manuum sensus natura mentitur."—De Anima, c. 17.

natural body and blood, cannot lessen the truth or disprove the fact, that they are even his body which was given and broken for us, and his blood which was shed for us. Each of these three things is true: and, as truth is ever consistent with itself, and "truth, in what kind soever, is by no truth gain-said:" so these things also are consistent with each other, and must be taken in a consistent sense. As "the potter hath power over the clay, of the same lump, to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour;" * and the honourable and dishonourable vessels are alike clay: so, though the bread and wine are changed by the word and grace of Christ to such an "heavenly use;" they are still as truly bread and wine, as the rest from which they were taken; while they are made honourable above all earthly things, representing and being to us the body and blood of Christ Himself, and the means of conveying to us the benefits of his death and passion.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor well says: "But Christ also affirmed concerning it [the bread], *This is my body*: and if faith can create an assent as strong as its object is infallible, or can be as certain in its conclusions as sense is certain in its apprehensions, we must at no hand doubt but that it is Christ's body. Let the sense of that be what it will, so that we believe those, and (whatsoever that sense is which Christ intended) that we no more doubt in our faith than we do in our sense, and then our faith is not reproveable. It is hard to do so much violence to our sense, as not to think it bread; but it is more unsafe to do so much violence to our faith as not to believe it to be Christ's body. But it would be considered that no interest of religion, no saying of Christ, no reverence of opinion, no sacredness of the mystery, is disavowed, if we believe both what we hear and what we see." †

* Rom. ix. 21.

† Life of Christ, vol. ix. p. 427, Heber's ed.

CHAPTER VII.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION : WHOLE CHRIST UNDER THE SPECIES.

IT was stated in the previous chapter, that Transubstantiation comprises first, a change in the bread and wine in the Eucharist, by which their proper substance is taken away, and their accidents are left subsisting together by themselves : secondly, a change of their whole substance into the whole substance of the body and blood of Christ : and thirdly, the real presence of Christ under the species of the bread and wine.

We have considered the first step in this stupendous doctrine : and we therefore now proceed to consider the second and the third things comprised in it.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation asserts that the whole substance of the bread and wine in the Eucharist is changed into the substance of the body and blood of Christ : and that this means the whole substance of the Lord's body and blood, is shown by the words of the Tridentine decree : " whole and perfect Christ exists under the species of bread, and under any part soever of that species : whole likewise under the species of wine, and under its parts." ⁴⁶

The term, change or conversion of the substance, Aquinas argues, precludes the idea of the annihilation of that substance or of its resolution into its first elements : and determines the ultimate extreme or term to be specifically the true body of Christ. ⁴⁷

⁴⁶ " Totus enim et integer Christus sub panis specie, et sub quavis ipsius speciei parte ; totus item sub vini specie, et sub ejus partibus existit."—Sess. 13, c. 3.

⁴⁷ " Cum per conversionem et non alio modo corpus Christi in Eucharistia esse incipiat, post consecrationem substantia panis vel vini non resolvitur in præjacentem materiam, nec annihilatur, sed convertitur in verum Christi corpus."—3a. q. 75, art. 3, con.

" Since it is by conversion, and in no other way, that the body of Christ begins to be in the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine is not resolved after consecration into its pre-existing [or underlying] matter, nor annihilated, but is converted into the true body of Christ.

The substance of the bread and wine, then, is conceived to be neither annihilated, nor reduced to its elements or previous underlying matter: it is preserved, although converted: yet it remains not, and the accidents subsist together without it.

And yet, if Aquinas rightly defines the limits of this conversion, no particle whatever of the substance of the elements becomes the substance of the body and blood of Christ. He says that "since in this Sacrament, something, namely the accidents of the bread, remains the same, some of these expressions may be allowed after a certain resemblance, namely, that bread is the body of Christ; or bread will be the body of Christ; or of bread is made the body of Christ; so that by the name of bread the substance of bread be not understood: but indefinitely that which is contained under the species of bread, under which first is contained the substance of bread, and afterwards the body of Christ.—And although it may be properly said, that from bread is made the body of Christ: yet it is not properly said, that bread is made the body of Christ, but after a certain similitude.—In this conversion, this whole is converted into that whole, so that nothing of the former remains: and yet that the accidents remain, the substance being destroyed. And so it is not allowed, that bread can be the body of Christ." ⁴⁵

"So here we have a transubstantiation without transubstantiation,"*—destruction, and yet preservation, of substance. According to common apprehension, Transubstantiation would seem to mean, not a destruction or even removal of the substance of the elements, but the transmutation of all its particles into the substance of the Lord's body and blood; a change of condition, connection, or mode of being. Whereas, if the description given above out of Aquinas, be the real doctrine, nothing of the substance of the elements is changed into another substance: it merely gives place to the body and blood of Christ: there is but a supercession of one substance by

⁴⁵ "Quia tamen in hoc Sacramento, facta conversione, aliquid idem manet, scilicet accidentia panis—secundum quandam similitudinem aliquæ harum locutionum possunt concedi, scilicet quod panis sit corpus Christi: vel panis erit corpus Christi, vel de pane fit corpus Christi, ut nomine panis non intelligatur substantia panis, sed in universali hoc quod sub speciebus panis continetur, sub quibus prius continetur substantia panis, et postea corpus Christi. Et ita etiam in proposito licet proprie dicatur, quod ex pane fiat corpus Christi: non tamen proprie dicitur, quod panis fiat corpus Christi, nisi secundum quandam similitudinem. Hoc totum convertitur in illud totum, ita quod nihil prioris remaneat—sed etiam—quod accidentia remaneant, corrupta substantia. Et ideo non conceditur, quod panis possit esse corpus Christi."—3a, q. 75, art. 8. c. 1st. 2nd. 3rd.

* Bramhall's Answer to M. de la Milletiere. Works, Oxford, 1842, i. 17.

the other, under cover of the species or accidents of the elements.⁴⁹

The desition and supercession are also represented as co-incidentaneous, whole, perfect, and absolute.

But the change of the elements, whether by transubstantiation in its strict sense, or by supercession, or by whatever other mode, is alleged to be into the body and blood of Christ; his very true and identical body which was born of the Virgin, and suffered death upon the cross; and his blood which there flowed from his wounds.

But the coinstantaneous effect of the conversion of the substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood of our Lord, is represented to be his real presence under the species of these elements.

Nay, although it may not be asserted categorically, it is our Lord's living and glorified body, into which the conversion is, in reality, conceived to be made. The decrees of Trent, as before cited, assert "that our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under

⁴⁹ "Tria sunt observanda. Primum est, ad veram conversionem quatuor conditiones requiri. Prima, ut aliquid desinat esse: non enim est intelligibile, ut unum convertatur in aliud, nisi id quod convertitur, desinat esse quod antea erat.

"Secunda conditio est, ut aliquid succedat in locum ejus quod desinit esse: alioqui non esset conversio, sed corruptio, vel annihilatio, si terminus illius actionis esset non esse rei. Atque hoc significamus cum dicimus, unum converti in alterum, sive quod fuit unum, nunc esse alterum: indicamus enim his sententiis unum alteri successisse.

"Tertia conditio est, ut sit connexio quædam et dependentia inter desitionem unius et successionem alterius, ita ut unum desinat, ut alterum succedat, et vi desitionis fiat successio.

"Quarta conditio est, ut tam terminus a quo, quam terminus ad quem, sit vere positivus. In hoc enim distinguitur perfecta conversio non solum a creatione, et annihilatione, sed etiam a naturali conversione."—Bellarmin, De Sacram. Euch. iii. 27. 554-557.

"Three things are to be noticed. The first is, that for true conversion four conditions are required. First, that something should cease to be; for it is not intelligible, that one thing should be converted into another, unless that which is converted cease to be that which it was before.

¶ 1. "The second condition is, that something succeed into the place of that which ceases to be; otherwise it would not be conversion, but corruption, or annihilation, if the term of that action were not the being of the thing. And this we signify when we say, that one thing is converted into another, or that which was one thing is now another; for by these expressions we indicate that one thing has succeeded to another.

"The third condition is, that there be a certain connection and dependence between the ceasing of one thing and the succession of the other, so that one thing should cease to be, in order that the other may succeed it, and that from the force of desition the succession should take place.

"The fourth condition is, that both the term *a quo* and the term *ad quem* be truly positive. For in this is distinguished perfect conversion, not only from creation and annihilation, but also from natural conversion."

the species of these sensible things ;” that his body and blood are contained in them in such condition, as to have his soul and divinity joined with them ; and that “ Christ, whole and perfect, is under each of the species and under every part of them.”

The words of consecration, are, indeed, represented as effecting the conversion merely of the bread into the body of Christ and of the wine into his blood ; but it is the body which has risen from the dead, and is to die no more ; the living body, together with his soul, “ by force of that natural connection and concomitance by which the parts of the Lord Christ are coupled together,” and his divinity by hypostatic union with body and soul.

Now, as it has been argued before, that where all, and only all, the properties of a thing subsist together, there is that thing itself ; so, conversely, we must maintain, that where the properties of a thing are not, the thing itself is not. And then, without attempting to enunciate or describe the properties of our Lord’s body, all our senses, all the means of knowledge with which we are naturally endowed, or by education and experience have attained, combine to assure us, that these properties are not contained in the consecrated elements. We look upon the elements of one Eucharist, we submit them to our other senses ; and must see and know, that they are altogether void of the inseparable properties of a human body. We look upon the separated parts of the Eucharist ; and, that the one indivisible body of our Lord is in each separated particle of the bread and in each separated drop of the wine, we see and know, if we can see or know anything, is against all nature, the nature of all things that are known to us, and against all reason. That the body of Christ, in most real and substantial fact, should be contained in the species of bread, and his blood in the wine, and in every part of them in every Eucharist, in many thousand different places over all the earth ; * no man can pretend to say or to maintain, without distinctions, which, in reality, are an acknowledgment that it is impossible.

But whatever difficulties, or impossibilities one may see in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the Romanist thinks nothing

* Aquinas says, that “ it is not possible for one body to be in more places than one locally, no, not by miracle, because it implies a contradiction.”—iv. Sent. Dist. 44. q. 2. art. 2. q. 3, cited in Bramhall’s Answer to De la Milletiere. Works, i. 15.

of them, since he is taught to believe that the power of God ⁵⁰ is pledged by his truth to overcome them; and with God all things are possible. He argues, therefore, that to object impossibility against his doctrine, is to put a presumptuous limit to the power of God.

Yet the Divine Word teaches that we must take the infallible assertion of all things being possible with God, under some limitations. It teaches, that "God cannot lie;" that "He cannot deny Himself:" and it is as plain and certain as anything within the compass of human knowledge or faith can be, that He cannot make the past not to be past; or make any event,—say the creation of the world, the incarnation of Christ, or his death for man,—to have not been. The past and the future cannot be made identical with the present: nor can the same body be made to exist at the same moment in different times. Is it more possible for the same body to exist at the same moment in different places? ⁵¹

Since, then, some things are not possible, even with God, we cannot bring in his power in favour of Transubstantiation, until it be first proved, that it is possible with Him. And therefore the plea of God's power is only, in fact, to assume the possibility of Transubstantiation for a proof that it is not impossible.

Be it remembered, that the question is not simply, whether such a thing can be done; but, whether such a thing, under *such circumstances*, can be done:—it is not simply, whether the substance of the elements can be converted into the body and blood of Christ: but whether a substance can be separated from all its accidents, and be changed into an entirely different substance, which shall put off all the accidents proper to itself, and assume the accidents of the other; or whether one substance can cease to be with its accidents, giving place to another sub-

⁵⁰ "Cum Dei summam omnium rerum potestatem credunt et confitentur, credant etiam necesse est, potestatem ei non defuisse maximi hujus operis efficiendi, quod in Eucharistiæ Sacramento admiramur et colimus."—Cat. Con. Trid. II. xxix. 1a. 186.

⁵¹ Augustine well says:—"Omnipotens est ad facienda omnia quæ facere voluerit. Nam ego dico quanta non posset. Non potest mori, non potest mentiri, non potest falli. Tanta non potest; quæ si posset, non esset omnipotens."—Serm. 113, Opp. v. 1061, Bened.

"Since they believe and confess that the power of God is supreme over all things, it is necessary that they should also believe that the power is not wanting to Him of effecting this most excellent work, which we admire and worship in the Sacrament of the Eucharist."

"He is omnipotent to do all things which He has willed to do. For I speak of how great things He could not do. He cannot die, He cannot lie, He cannot be deceived. So great things He cannot do; which, if He could do, He would not be omnipotent."

stance, which shall be without its own accidents, and shall be contained under the accidents of the substance it has displaced: and whether this and that piece of bread, and hundreds of thousands of pieces of bread, in hundreds of thousands of places, in England, at Rome, at the Antipodes, can each of them, and each fragment of them, contain "whole Christ," in the whole complex notion of his adorable person: and yet that there should be but one Christ, sitting all the while in heaven at the right hand of God. These and many other like inevitable conditions, would show that the conversion for which the Romanists contend, is impossible; however possible it might be, in itself, without any opposing conditions.

Yet more: if it were even proved to be possible under all the conditions of the case, it would still remain to be proved that it is the will of God to do it. And that it is not his will to do it, we may be assured from these few considerations: first, that his holy word nowhere declares that such is his will; but on the contrary teaches us that "the flesh profiteth nothing," * that "the letter" of the flesh "killeth:" † secondly, that it is not necessary to be done; for that "it is the spirit that quickeneth:" and thirdly, that so far from being conducive to salvation, it would be "a heinous wickedness and crime," as St. Augustine says, in the letter, to eat the flesh, or drink the blood of Christ.

But after all, "the doctrine of Transubstantiation," as Bishop Taylor says, is "infinitely useless, and to no purpose: for by the words of our blessed Lord, by the doctrine of St. Paul, and the sense of the Church, and the confession of all sides, the natural eating of Christ's flesh,—if it were there or could be so eaten alone, or of itself—does no good, does not give life; but the spiritual eating of Him is the instrument of life to us: and this may be done without the transubstantiated flesh; it may be done in baptism, by faith and charity, by hearing and understanding, and therefore it may also in the blessed Eucharist, although there also, according to our doctrine, to be eaten only sacramentally, and spiritually. And hence it is, that in the Mass book, anciently it is prayed after consecration 'Quæsumus, omnipotens Deus, ut, de perceptis muneribus, gratias exhibentes, beneficia potiora sumemus: '[We beseech thee, Almighty God, that we rendering thanks for the benefits received, may take greater benefits:] ‡—which, besides that it

* John vi. 63. † 2 Cor. iii. 6. ‡ Serm. vi. 4. temp. Septem. post Consecrat.

concludes against the natural presence of Christ's body, (for what greater thing can we receive, if we receive *that*?) it also declares, that the grace and effect of the sacramental communion are the things designed before all corporal sumption." *

* Jer. Taylor on the Real Presence, iii. ix. 446, 447.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONSUBSTANTIATION, AND THE NINETEENTH CENTURY DOCTRINE
OF THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE.

WITH the doctrine of "the Real Presence," as taught by the Church of Rome, the doctrine of Luther,—by whatsoever name it may be called,—and the doctrine of a party which has lately sprung up in the Church of England, entirely symbolise: for though they deny the transubstantiation of the elements, they maintain that, after consecration, our Lord's glorified body, and therefore, necessarily, his soul and divinity, are with, or under the forms of the bread and wine. Luther asks, "Why may not Christ contain His body within the substance of the bread, as well as in the accidents? Behold the two substances, fire and iron, are so mingled in glowing iron, that every part is iron and fire. Why much more may not the glorious body of Christ be thus in every part of the substance of the bread?"⁵²

The doctrine which Luther adopted and so zealously propounded was further explained, or accounted for, by the notion of ubiquity, or power of being everywhere present, which some Lutherans supposed to be possessed by the human nature of Christ. But this notion is altogether inconsistent with the truth of Christ's body, and is much more allied to the heresy of Marcion in ancient times, and of the rationalists and pantheists of our own, than to sound doctrine. For it has been justly said, that this notion of ubiquity "gives no more to the Sacrament than to everything else. Christ's body may be said to be in everything, or rather, everything may be said to be his body and blood, as well as the elements in the Sacrament." If the body of Christ be a true human body, it is also finite; and it is, therefore, as impossible for it to be everywhere present, as for the finite to be infinite. That He is everywhere

⁵² "Cur autem non possit Christus corpus suum intra substantiam panis continere, sicut in accidentibus? Ecce ignis et ferrum duæ substantiæ, sic miscentur in ferro ignito, ut quælibet pars sit ferrum et ignis. Cur non multo magis corpus gloriosum Christi sic in omni parte substantiæ panis esse possit?"—De Capt. Bab. Eccl. 264a.

present in his divine nature, we know and believe; but we must ever remember, that as there is no “conversion of the Godhead into flesh,” so there is no “confusion of substance” in his person: that each nature, the Manhood and the Godhead, remains for ever distinct from each other, though joined together in his one person, “by taking of the Manhood into God:” and that “as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man,” each retaining its distinct properties, “so God and Man is one Christ,” without any conversion of substance, or any confusion; “any diminution or obliteration of the one nature by the other:”* “but each nature retaining its distinct properties; the Godhead its perfections, the Manhood its essential imperfections and limits.”

There are some peculiar difficulties which attend upon the doctrine of Consubstantiation; as, for instance, the supposition of two corporeal substances occupying the same space at the same time. It has also other difficulties in common with Transubstantiation, as “the impossibility of a body’s being without extension, or in more places” † than one at the same time. But, after what has been said, we need not spend time upon these difficulties: since they have only to be clearly stated to be shown to be insuperable.

Dr. Pusey teaches the objective Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, and that this “Real and objective Presence does not involve any physical change in the natural elements, which are the veils and channels of our Lord’s Unseen Presence.” ‡ He sometimes calls this, indeed, “the real Presence of the Body of Christ:” § but he means the living, glorified body, as is evident from the above-cited words. In another place, in order to account for the inconsistency of his doctrine with the “law—impressed upon physical nature, that two bodies cannot be in the same place at the same time,” he refers to our Lord’s resurrection, as a passage, “in His spiritual Body—through the sealed tomb: to His appearance to the disciples when the doors were shut, as a passage through the closed doors, as He had passed before, *illæsa virginitate*, through the doors of the Virgin’s womb.” And he says that “the substance of” our Lord’s “Body passed through the substance of the doors,” and that “as it passed, it must have been in the same place, penetrating, but not displacing them.” || And, in another work, he

* Bampton Lectures, 1837, p. 211.

† Burnet on the Articles. Art. 28.

‡ The Presence of Christ a Comfort to the Penitent, vii.

§ Ibid. 14.

|| Ibid. 23. See Appendix S.

says: "Where God's Almighty Word causes His Body to be, *there* His Godhead is, because it is inseparable; *there* is Christ Himself, our Redeeming Lord, the Object of our thankfulness and reverence, and love, and adoration."* And again: "Why then should we think it too strange a thing for His marvellous condescension, that He should now give us His blessed Body and Blood under the form of bread and wine? Or how should His Body which He gives us, not be His living, life-giving Body? Or how should His life-giving Body be apart from His Godhead, which makes it life-giving? Or how, since His Godhead is present there, should we not adore?"†

With equal learning, but more logical method, Archdeacon Wilberforce upheld the same views in his work on "The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." I know not whether his sad defection from our Church has lessened the esteem in which this work was at first regarded: but its great ability and deep piety will ever secure a high character for it amongst works on this subject. At all events, as I cannot but regard it as a storehouse of learning and argument on the questions of which it treats, I must make frequent references to its statements of doctrine, and to the testimonies and arguments by which he endeavours to establish and maintain them. He says that "in the Holy Eucharist" the "inward reality is the Body and Blood of Christ;"‡ with which expression he uses, "the Presence of our Lord's Body,"§ as synonymous: "that Body which was once humbled, but is now exalted;" "that self-same Body—which He had taken of the Blessed Virgin."|| This "Presence of our Lord's Body," he calls "the very Presence of His Humanity," "the actual Humanity of the Son of God:"¶ and "the Presence of His Body,"** "which has taken" up its dwelling in the consecrated elements,†† "is the reason why He Himself is present."

But while "the mention of our Lord's Body and Blood implies the Presence of His man's nature, yet by virtue of that personal union, whereby the manhood was taken into God, it involves the Presence of the Godhead also," and our Lord "must be understood to imply that He Himself, Godhead, Soul, and Body, was the gift communicated,"‡‡ and, therefore, it would be argued, present.

And the presence of our Lord's very true personal body is

* The Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church, 1857, c. 3, p. 330.

† Ibid. pp. 335, 336.

‡ P. 347.

§ P. 108.

|| Pp. 1, 93, 94.

¶ Pp. 42, 38, 39.

** Pp. 173, 174.

†† P. 172.

‡‡ Pp. 90, 91.

thus argued to be possible: "our Lord's Human Body is not subject to the laws of material existence, because His Body is a glorified Body," * which has "new qualities—gained by oneness with Deity," † for it is "the Body of God." ‡ This he says is "the *res sacramenti*," and is "contained in, and communicated through"—the "outward" elements.§

A Memorial or Declaration was addressed to Archbishop Longley in the year 1867, by Mr. Butler, and twenty others, "exercising the office of the Priesthood within the Church of England," in defence of "the Doctrines of the Real Objective Presence, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and of the Adoration of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament." They "repudiate the opinion of a 'Corporal Presence of CHRIST's natural Flesh and Blood;' that is to say, of the Presence of His Body and Blood as they 'are in Heaven;' and the conception of the mode of His Presence which implies the physical change of the natural substances of the bread and wine, commonly called 'Transubstantiation.'" They "believe, that in the Holy Eucharist,—the Body and Blood of our Saviour CHRIST, 'the inward part, or Thing signified,' are present, really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, under 'the outward visible part or sign,' or 'form of Bread and Wine:' and also, 'that CHRIST Himself, really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, Present in the Sacrament, is therein to be adored.'" ||

The doctrine, then, of this Declaration is that of "the Real Objective Presence—of the Body and Blood of Christ,"—of Christ Himself, really and truly—Present in the Sacrament," and "therein to be adored:" that is, of the living and glorified body of our Lord, with his Soul and Godhead.

The same doctrine is indirectly maintained by Mr. Carter in his correspondence with Mr. Marriott: and in a Letter to his parishioners he maintains "The Presence of our Lord in His very Body, and His very blood, alive, and life-giving." (1867, p. 111.) And in the "Tracts for the Day," edited by Mr. Orby Shipley, it is declared that, "at the moment of consecration, Christ unites Himself, Body, Soul, Divinity, in an ineffable manner, with the Elements of Bread and Wine; and so near does this approach to the union of the Divine and Human in the Incarnation, that Bishop Andrewes' calls it, 'a kind of Hypostatical Union of the Sign and the Thing signi-

* P. 153.

† P. 155.

‡ P. 96.

§ P. 123.

|| First Report of the Commissioners on the Rubrics, Append. 128, 129.

fied, so united together as are the Two Natures of Christ." (Sermon 16, On the Nativity.)*

It would be superfluous to accumulate further proof, that, excepting the transubstantiation of the bread and wine, the doctrine of Luther and of a party in the Church of England perfectly agrees with the doctrine of the Church of Rome, in asserting the Real Presence, or the Real Objective Presence, of our Lord Jesus Christ, of his glorified body, his Soul, and his Godhead, in or with the bread and wine, or under the forms of bread and wine.

Now, first, as to this use of the name or term—the Real Presence, I do not find that it is of earlier date than the era of the Reformation. I have diligently searched, and I cannot find one instance of the use of this term, before the year A.D. 1504, when the Hussites in Bohemia, in a letter to Ladislaus, asserted that "the words of our Saviour Jesus Christ—said nothing of the Real Presence." † Of our Lord's dwelling in heaven, the term Real Presence was used by Bernardus Clarævallensis, A.D. 1115:‡ but in all the authorities alleged for the doctrine of "the Real Presence under the form of bread and wine," I cannot find one before the sixteenth century. Bishop Jewell affirms that "the Fathers never used these terms 'really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally, present in the Sacrament.'" § And in the proposition: "that in the Sacrament of the Altar, by virtue of God's word pronounced by the priest, there is really and naturally the very body of Christ present, as it was conceived of the Virgin Mary, under the kinds of bread and wine," Bishop Latimer said: "methinketh it is set forth with certain new terms, lately found." || And Archbishop Cranmer spoke of "new fangled novelties of words:"¶ and Bishop Ridley objected to the "diversity and newness of the phrase."** Therefore, adopting Mr. Trevor's words on the novelty of the term "Real Objective Presence," I must submit that the more ancient form "Real Presence," "cannot escape the suspicion which justly attaches to every innovation on the terminology of the Church. We are not now to learn that new and unauthorised words imply new and unauthorised conceptions." ††

* No. 5, *The Real Presence*, pp. 16, 17.

† L'Arroque, II. xix. p. 510.

‡ Hospinian, I. iv. 3, vol. i. p. 342. § Adv. Harding, Parker Society's Ed., p. 455.

|| Remains, pp. 251, 252, Disputation at Oxford.

¶ Disputations at Oxford. Works, Cambridge, 1844, p. 395.

** Ibid. Works, Cambridge, 1843, p. 195. †† Catholic Doctrine, v. pp. 82, 83.

CHAPTER IX.

THE LITERAL INTERPRETATION DEMANDED BY THE TEACHERS
OF THE REAL PRESENCE, BUT MISTAKEN BY THEM.

THIS doctrine of the Real Presence in the bread and wine, the Church of Rome declares is set forth in the words of our Lord in "their proper and most plain signification." * Luther said that, "as far as can be done, the divine words are to be kept in the most simple signification, and unless a manifest circumstance compel it, they are not to be taken out of their grammatical and proper signification." † And Dr. Pusey says: "All things combine to make us take our Lord's words solemnly and literally;" and through many pages he presses the literal sense. ‡ Archdeacon Wilberforce says: "that our Lord's words of institution were to be taken in their simple and natural sense, was the belief of all ancient writers." § And Bishop Moberley speaks in yet stronger words, contending for the very strictest interpretation; and that "we are rigidly and absolutely bound to the exact words," and to take "neither more nor less," than "that which they exactly convey." ||

This demand of a literal construction is just. I join in it, and accept the reasons on which it is founded. I think and maintain, that it must be allowed, and cannot "be excluded;" and this, for the very sufficient reason, that, as Dr. Pusey most rightly says, it "is the basis of the spiritual sense," ¶ the necessary basis of the spiritual and true sense.

But, strange indeed to say, none of those who have made this demand, and professed to make the literal interpretation the ground of their doctrine, have themselves adhered to it, or rightly applied it. This, I admit, is a most serious charge; but serious as it is, and reflecting upon generations of learned

* Conc. Trid., sess. 13, c. 1.

† See Appendix T.

‡ The Presence of Christ, p. 26, &c.

§ Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, c. 4, p. 92.

|| Bampton Lectures, pp. 171, 172.

¶ The Presence of Christ, p. 34.

and able writers, I am prepared, and now proceed, to demonstrate and establish it.

Now, in the first place, we have to consider what are the words, of which the strictly literal sense is to be ascertained. There is, indeed, no controversy or doubt about them, what they are: the whole of Christendom would, with one voice, reply that they are the words which were spoken by our Lord, when He celebrated the first Eucharist. But unhappily for the cause of truth and sound doctrine, systems of Eucharistic faith have been universally built upon a mutilation of them.

Now the Divine records tell us that "as they were eating" the Passover, "Jesus took the bread,* and blessed, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat: this is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament, = this cup is the New Testament in my blood,† which is shed for you‡ and for many,§ for the remission of sins;|| this do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me.¶ For I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

Several propositions are here expressed or implied; some of more, some of less, but all of them of some consequence. But the chief importance belongs to the words which our Lord spoke in delivering the bread and the cup: "Take, eat; this is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. This is my blood which is shed for you; this do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me." These are the words of which we are to find "the proper and most plain," and "the most simple, grammatical, and proper signification," "the simple and natural sense," and "neither more nor less" than "that which they exactly convey."

But first let us see how these words have been dealt with, and what is the sense, which, pursuant to these demands, has been assigned to them.

1. The Church of Rome, in consecrating** the bread, takes

* St. Matt. † St. Luke and St. Paul. ‡ St. Luke. § St. Matt. and St. Mark.
 || St. Matth. ¶ St. Paul. ** See Appendix V.

only the words, "Hoc est corpus meum," "This is my body;" the instantaneous effect of which words is stated to be the conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the whole substance of the body of Christ, "His true body, which was born of the Virgin, sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven," and "is to die no more:"⁵³ that is to say in shorter form, the glorified body of Christ. The conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the whole substance of the Lord's glorified body, is stated to be the effect, and is put for "the proper and most plain signification" of the words "This is my body."

The cup is consecrated with this fuller form: "This is the chalice of my blood of the New and eternal Testament: the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many, to the remission of sins." And the effect of these words is stated to be the instantaneous conversion of the whole substance of the wine into the whole substance of the blood of Christ:—

But, be it observed, the body and blood of our Lord separate in neither: neither the body without the blood, nor the blood without the body; and neither again without the soul: but the body, and the blood, and the soul together, under each species, "by force of that natural connection and concomitance, by which the parts of Christ the Lord, who is risen from the dead, to die no more, are joined together." In short, it is declared to be "most true, that just as much is contained under either species as under both; for Christ, whole and perfect, is under the species of bread, and under every particle of it; and whole under the species of wine, and under every particle of it."*

Thus under the form of the bread is declared to be contained our Lord's body with the blood, and under the form of the wine his blood with the body; exactly the same under each separately: under the form of the bread, by virtue of the words, "This is my body;" under the form of the wine, by virtue of the words, "This is the chalice of my blood:" by concomitance also, the soul of our Lord under each; and by the hypostatic union, his divinity under each. In short, by transubstantiation, by concomitance, and by hypostatic union, Christ whole and perfect, God and man, is contained, according to the Romish doctrine, under the form of bread and under the form of wine, and equally under each.

⁵³ "Verum Christi Domini corpus, illud idem quod, natum ex Virgine, in cælis sedet ad dexteram Patris."—Cat. Con. Trid., II. xxv. "Non amplius moriturus."—Con. Trid., sess. 13, c. 3.

* Con. Trid., sess. 13, c. 3.

And this is said to be in strict accordance with “the proper and most plain signification” of the words of institution: which is to say, that the words: “This is my body which is given for you,” mean, in “the proper and most plain signification,” “This contains my glorified body;” and the words, “This is my blood which is shed for you,” mean, “in the proper and most plain signification,” “This contains the blood of my glorified body.”

2. The doctrine of Luther, as has been shown, is that “the glorious body of Christ is in or with the bread:” and Gerhard says that the words of the institution, “This is my body,” are most fitly resolved by “In, with, or under, this bread, I exhibit my body.”*

3. And the doctrine of Dr. Pusey, and of those whom he so ably leads or represents, is, as has been shown, that the living body of Christ, together with his Godhead, is present under the form of the bread and wine: that our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect man and perfect God, is really in them.

In all these systems, then,—the Roman, the Lutheran, and the Tractarian,—it is the living, glorified body of our Lord, which is believed to be under the species, in or with the outward forms. It is our very living Lord Himself who is believed to be really present in each. There is a slight difference as to the causes of that presence, whether consecration or otherwise; and as to the time when his presence actually begins and terminates; but the presence itself is in all believed to be precisely the same.

Since, therefore, it is the glorified body of Christ into which the Roman system teaches that the substance of the bread is converted; which the Lutheran system asserts to be present, taken, and received with the bread; and which the Tractarian system declares to be present under the outward forms: and since this is unanimously asserted by all the three systems and their advocates, to be “the proper and most plain, the grammatical, most simple, and natural signification” of our Lord’s words, and to be “neither more nor less” than “that which they exactly convey;”—in one word, is asserted to be their literal

* *Loc. Theol. de Sacra Cœna*, X. lxi. *Opp. Francof.* 1647, vol. v. 55, 56, and xevi.

sense: we must examine into the truth of this allegation; and see whether the literal sense be indeed that which it is thus asserted to be.

But these several statements of the "Real Presence" must first be translated into the form of our Lord's words, and reduced to categorical propositions like his.

Now, there is no question necessary to be noticed here as to the subjects of the propositions into which our Lord's words form themselves: for the questions which have been raised about the meaning of them, and have been so variously determined, have arisen only from a supposed meaning of the predicates, and from the necessity of making subject and predicate reconcilable with each other. We must therefore take the "This" of our Lord's words for the subject of each of the propositions which declare the Roman, Lutheran, and Tractarian doctrines.

Then, although, in logical strictness, the copula must necessarily be the same: yet, instead of the simple copula, "is," each of the three systems substitutes, in reality, what I shall here, for convenience, call a compound copula: because the use of the simple logical copula would require an awkward and unnecessary periphrasis. And since the Roman doctrine is, that whole Christ glorified is contained under the species of the bread; this, being brought into the form of our Lord's words, will read: "This contains, or has, under its species, my glorified body." Since the Lutheran doctrine is, that the glorified body of Christ is in, with, or under the bread; this, in the form of our Lord's words, will read: "This has with it my glorified body." And since the Tractarian doctrine is that the glorified body of Christ is present in the bread or under the form of bread; this, again, in the form of our Lord's words, will read: "This has in it, or under its form, the presence of my glorified body." Thus, therefore, as equivalent to the simple copula "is," in our Lord's words, the Roman doctrine has the compound copula, "has under its species:" the Lutheran doctrine presents the compound copula, "has with it:" and the Tractarian doctrine, again, has the compound copula, "has under its form the presence of."

And, lastly, the predicate given by each of these three systems is, "my glorified body." It might be enlarged in all the three propositions by such additions as may be collected

from the statements of the respective doctrines which have been before made: but this is sufficient for the present purpose.

Thus, then, the proposition which the Church of Rome virtually and in reality presents, as expressing "the proper and most plain signification of the words, 'This is my body which is broken for you,'" is—

"This⁵⁴ contains, or has, under its species, my glorified body."

The Lutheran proposition for the grammatical and proper signification, is—

"This⁵⁵ has with it my glorious or glorified body."

And the Tractarian proposition for the strictly literal meaning is—

"This has under its form the presence of my glorified body."

These propositions are, in absolute truth and reality, as any logician who will set himself to the task must acknowledge, those which are implicitly set forth for the literal meaning of our Lord's words; and as, in fact, identical propositions with the propositions which those words express.

Now let the original words be put down, with the three so-called literal significations under them, and it will be at once manifest that there is a great difference between them.

THIS	IS	MY BODY WHICH IS GIVEN FOR YOU.
R. THIS ⁵⁶	HAS UNDER ITS SPECIES	MY GLORIFIED BODY.
L. THIS	HAS WITH IT	MY GLORIFIED BODY.
T. THIS	{ HAS UNDER ITS FORM THE					} MY GLORIFIED BODY.	
	PRESENCE OF		

⁵⁴ What "This" means has been much disputed by the theologians of Rome. They will not allow it to be the bread, for this would overthrow Transubstantiation. Bellarmine decides it to mean, "This thing which is contained under the species of bread." But if the subject be as he thus determines, then the proposition, fully expressed, will be: "This thing which is contained under the species of bread has under its species my glorified body:" which virtually makes the subject and predicate the same thing. The definition is suicidal.

⁵⁵ "Luther correctly pointed first to the fact that we naturally use the neuter when speaking of a thing which lies before us."—Stier on the Words of the Lord Jesus, Matt. xvi. 26–28; Clarke, vii. 94. Bengel has: "Hoc quod vos sumere jubeo:" "this thing which I command you to take."

⁵⁶ It is unnecessary to mark the difference here, or in the words with which our Lord gave the cup.

Thus, instead of the simple word or copula, "is," the Roman system reads, "has under its species:" the Lutheran reads, "has with it:" and the Tractarian reads, "has under its form the presence of." And, instead of "my body which is given for you," all the three read, "my glorified body." Even if they went no farther than saying "my body," the propositions would be essentially and most importantly different from our Lord's words. "Has under its species my body:" "has with it my body:" "has in it the presence of my body:" are not identical in meaning with "is my body;" but far from it. And still more important is the remaining difference. Our Lord said, "my body which is given for you;" but these systems say, "my glorified body," "I myself."

We must turn now to those other words: "This is my blood which is shed for you." The three systems of doctrine under review interpret these words in apparent harmony with their interpretations of these other words, "This is my body which is given for you;" but the interpretation of one proposition is given in entire oblivion of the consequences of the interpretation of the other.

Let these words be placed in juxtaposition with the several interpretations of them, as we have placed the other words with their interpretations.

THIS	IS	MY BLOOD WHICH IS SHED FOR YOU.			
R. THIS	HAS UNDER ITS SPECIES	MY BLOOD WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU.			
L. THIS	HAS WITH IT	MY BLOOD WHICH IS SHED FOR YOU.			
T. THIS	<table border="0" style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">HAS UNDER ITS FORM</td> <td rowspan="2" style="font-size: 2em; padding: 0 5px;">}</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">THE PRESENCE OF</td> </tr> </table>	HAS UNDER ITS FORM	}	THE PRESENCE OF	MY BLOOD WHICH IS SHED FOR YOU.
HAS UNDER ITS FORM	}				
THE PRESENCE OF					

The subject and the copula, or the compound copula, are the same respectively as before; and the predicates are the same as in our Lord's words, with the exception of the Roman proposition, which, not to mention interpolations and additions not as yet noticed, has "which shall be shed," instead of "is shed." And there is an important distinction, as may appear presently.

Now it is obvious that a proposition asserting the real presence of our Lord's glorified body under the species, or with the bread, or under the form of bread, is impossible to be reconciled with a proposition asserting the real presence of his

blood shed with or under the form of wine : for in the glorified body the blood is no longer, nor ever can be, shed. The blood shed, on the one hand, argues the body to be dead on the other hand : for the shedding of our Lord's blood was the pouring out of his life.*

But the natural consequence of making our Lord's words in delivering the bread an assertion of "The Real Presence," has been, in the first place, a mutilation of the words ; and in the second place, an utter oblivion in argument and in doctrine of those other words : "This is my blood which is shed for you."

From the comparison presented above of the Roman, Lutheran, and Tractarian senses of our Lord's words in delivering the bread, with the words themselves, it is seen at once that only some of the words are taken,— "This is my body ;" and that the words, "which is given for you," are altogether left out of consideration. And this is the case, it may be said, in all the treatises of Romanist divines on the Eucharist. Even in the "Canon of the Mass," the consecration of the bread is performed by these words only : "Hoc est corpus meum : " and the other words which were spoken with the bread are quite left out. The Council of Trent teaches that "in the precious Sacrament of the Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things :"⁵⁷ thus perfectly ignoring all of the words but "Hoc est corpus meum." And to instance Bellarmine only of Romanist writers, he has in his treatise on the Eucharist a chapter in which he expounds, each by itself, those four words "Hoc est corpus meum ;" and takes no notice of the words which our Lord added to them, practically ignoring altogether, throughout his work, the words which He spake in delivering the cup.

Luther, in the conference at Marburg, and Melancthon disputing with Zuinglius, built all their arguments upon "Hoc est corpus meum : " and Luther, to keep himself the more strictly to his thesis, and to manifest his immovable opinion, wrote the words in large characters before him on the table.†

* Isa. liii. 12.

⁵⁷ "Docet sancta Synodus, et aperte, et simpliciter profitetur, in almo sanctæ Eucharistiæ Sacramento, post panis et vini consecrationem, Dominum nostrum, Jesum Christum, verum Deum, atque hominem, vere, realiter, ac substantialiter, sub specie illarum rerum sensibilibus contineri."—Sess. 13, c. 1.

† Hospinian. Hist. Sacr. II., A.D. 1529, vol. ii., 75a. Daubigné's Hist. of the Reformation, Book xiii. c. 7 ; Glasgow, iv. 77.

And amongst the modern advocates in the Church of England of "The Real Objective Presence under the form of bread and wine," Archdeacon Wilberforce is very noteworthy. He takes the words "This is my body; this is my blood:" deals with them in logical form—the subjects, the copula, and the predicates: but goes on throughout his work as if he had only to deal with the words "This is my body." All the other words of institution are, in effect, treated as mere surplusage, and as if they had no meaning or bearing upon the subject. Let anyone who is in possession of the Archdeacon's work take it and blot out every place in which the words "which is given for you, This is my blood which is shed for you," are recited; and he will find that they have not the least influence upon the argument or the doctrine which it is used to enforce.⁵⁸

Thus are the words of the institution mutilated, and in part ignored. Portentous error has been the result. The words retained in the consecration of the Mass, and in substance of argument, have been misinterpreted, and in logical consequence, the Sacrament has been mutilated. For when our Lord's living body, when our Lord Himself, is conceived to be present in, with, or under, the bread or its species, the words "This is my blood which is shed for you" have no meaning, but to signify his Presence, so to take it, in, with, or under the wine or its species. But since, according to the doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence," there is nothing in the one element which is not in the other, and the communicant in receiving the bread receives whole Christ, as He is, perfect God and perfect man: there is no need, or indeed fitness, for him to receive the wine also. It adds nothing to what he has already received. And thus the cup is a mere superfluity in the Sacrament, and in consequence has been denied by Rome.

But this is not all. The interpretations of those who teach the doctrine of "The Real Presence" are virtually, and necessarily imply, a denial of our Lord's words. For he who says with the Romanist, that in the species of bread is contained whole Christ, denies implicitly that the bread is the body of Christ: he who says with the Lutheran that the body of Christ is in, with, or under, the bread, implicitly denies that the bread is the body of Christ: and he who with the Tractarian says

⁵⁸ Mr. Palmer takes the same method, and wrongly makes the Church of England responsible for it, in his statement of the "Anglo-Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist."—Treatise on the Church of Christ, 1838, i. 526, 527.

that the body of Christ is present under the form of the bread, implicitly denies that the bread is the body of Christ. Each and all necessarily imply that the bread itself is not the body of Christ. Whereas He said of the bread, "This is my body." They necessarily imply also a denial that the wine is the blood of Christ.

And the denial of his words is the more marked, in that they say that it is the glorified body of Christ which is contained in the species of bread, or is joined with the bread, or is present under its form; whereas He said, "This is my body which is given for you." And those other words also are virtually denied which He spake of the wine, "This is my blood which is shed for you:" and the assertion of the glorified body, and of the blood in or under the wine or its form, is also self-contradictory: for the blood of the glorified body is not shed. In short, these systems of doctrine deny the truth declared by his voice, that the bread is his body, his body which is given for us, and that the wine is his blood which is shed for us. A total denial of his words underlies each and all of these doctrines.

Such is the way in which the words of our Lord, proposed for interpretation, have been dealt with, and such is the consequence of their treatment: a mutilation of the Sacrament, and a denial of our Lord's words.

CHAPTER X.

THE LITERAL INTERPRETATION VINDICATED.

WE now proceed to ascertain what is, in truth, the literal interpretation of the words, in which our Lord instituted this Sacrament.

But, first, we must remember and follow that cardinal rule in the interpretation of Scripture, that the context of a place should always be taken into account with it; for there is no place in which a consideration of the context is more necessary than in this.

We will take, then, the words of our Lord with their context, that is, the account as I have cited it.

“Jesus took the bread,⁵⁹ and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said Take, eat; this is my body.” Now it will be noticed that He did not say, “This signifies my body,” “This is changed into my body,” “This has my body with it,” or “This has the real presence of my body in it,” as the various theories do, in reality, interpret the words: but that He said “This—IS—my body.” And “He took the cup” with the wine which had been poured into it, “and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, This is my blood.” Here, again, He said not, “This signifies my blood,” “This is changed into my blood,” “This has my blood with it,” or “This has in it the real presence of my blood,” as these theories do in reality interpret the words, if they give them any meaning at all;⁶⁰ but He said, “This—IS—my blood.”

Nor did He say merely, “This is my body—This is my blood:”

⁵⁹ “St. Matthew alone uses the article, τὸν ἄρτον, and thereby defines it to have been the unleavened bread then present on the table: the other accounts, which have merely ‘bread,’ or ‘a bread,’ serve probably a twofold purpose thereby. They intimate, first, that *bread* simply as such was sufficient for an ordinance which was not bound to the paschal ceremony, which was not limited to Israel, and which had a far higher meaning than the mere continuation of the Old Testament rite. And then, by the generalisation, which forsakes the historical style, they prepare for the observance of that mystery, in which our common earthly bread was so marvellously sanctified.”—Stier on the Words of the Lord Jesus, Matt. xxvi. 26–28; Clarke, vii. 85, 86.

⁶⁰ Dr. Pusey speaks of “the real Presence of our Lord’s Blood in the Cup.”—Doctrine

but He said, "This is my body which is given for you—This is my blood which is shed for you:" and these added words, which are so commonly overlooked on all sides, are of the utmost importance in determining the interpretation. For in the words "which is given for you," "given" means, of necessity, "given to God, offered in sacrifice to Him for the sins of men:" and therefore the body of Christ which is given to God, means in strictly literal interpretation, his body sacrificed, his body dead. And the words "which is shed for you," are more properly and literally, "which is poured out for you."

But looking to the tenses of these participles, it will be seen that they admit of a yet more literal rendering, though in order to express it, we must use the un-idiomatic forms, "which is being given, which is being shed." "This is my body which is being given for you; This is my blood which is being shed for you," is therefore the strictly literal and grammatical English for our Lord's words. And "the proper, most plain, simple, and natural signification," which the words "exactly, and neither more nor less, convey," is: "This is my body, which is being given in sacrifice to God for you:—This is my blood which is being shed in sacrifice to God for you." That is to say, it is the Lord's body in a sacrificial state, a state of sacrifice, his dead body. Thus the letter contains no more. There is nothing in it of his risen or glorified body: and to interpret the words of the risen and glorified body of our Lord is to impose on them a meaning which it is absolutely impossible for them to bear, and utterly inconsistent with his words.

And this circumstance is to be carefully noted, that our Lord gave the bread and the cup separately from each other: He gave his body separately by itself, and his blood separately by itself. But since "the blood is the life;" when the blood is poured out, and separated, from the body, the body is dead. The body therefore, which He gave, was his dead body.⁶¹ It

of the Real Presence, 326. But how is this to be reconciled with the real presence of his glorified body in the bread? It seems to me that the teachers of the Real Presence of these days are insensible to the force of their own words.

⁶¹ Dr. Pusey appeals to Bishop Andrewes as his master in Eucharistic doctrine. But he must have overlooked such passages as the following: "Christ, how or when? not every way, nor at every time considered; but as and when He was 'offered up,' *immolatus*, offered up as a sacrifice."—Bp. Andrewes' Sermon 7 on the Resurrection: Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol. ii. 291.

"*Oblatus*: so He may be, and yet alive; but the word is *ἐτίθη*, *immolatus*, 'offered,' and 'offered in sacrifice.' A live lamb is not it. It is a lamb slain must be our Passover."—Ibid. 296.

"*Epulemur* doth here refer to *immolatus* (1 Cor. v. 8). To Christ, not every way

would be a contradiction to say that it was his living or glorified body; for in his risen and glorified state, it is impossible for the body and blood to be separated. By the very act He showed that it was the dead, and not the living, much less the glorified, body, which He gave.

Our Lord said nothing of his glorified body; nor will the literal interpretation admit the notion of his glorified body being in the Sacrament, in, or under, or with the outward forms.⁶²

True, it is the body which is now glorified: but, as Bishop Andrewes well said, not in that state or condition. We cannot eat the glorified body,—at least, it is contrary to the analogy and all notions of his glorified body; neither can we drink of the blood of his glorified body; for it cannot be poured out. We eat not a living body, but a dead body.*

It is therefore utterly beyond the question, to speak of the capabilities and powers of the risen or glorified body of Christ: and all the subtle metaphysics⁶³ which have been employed to prove that it can be in heaven, unmoved, at the right hand of

considered, but as when He was offered. Christ's body that now is. True; but not Christ's body as it now is, but as then it was, when it was offered, rent, and slain, and sacrificed for us. Not, as now He is, glorified, for so He is not, so He cannot be *immolatus*, for He is immortal and impassible. But as then He was when He suffered death, that is, passible and mortal. Then, in His passible state did He institute this of ours, to be a memorial of His *passibile* and *passio* both. And we are in this action not only carried up to Christ (*sursum corda*), but we are also carried back to Christ as He was at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering. So, and no otherwise, doth this text teach. So, and no otherwise, do we represent Him. By the incomprehensible power of His Eternal Spirit, not He alone, but He, as at the very act of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into His death, and invested in the benefit of it. If an host could be turned into Him, now glorified as He is, it would not serve; Christ offered is it,—thither we must look. To the Serpent lifted up, thither we must repair, even *ad cadaver*; we must *hoc facere*, do that is then done. So, and no otherwise, is this *epulari* to be conceived."—*Ibid.* pp. 302, 303.

I must refer the reader to other parts of this work for more authorities to the same purport. But I will here add one from the Homilies: "This table is not (saith Chrysostom) for chattering jays, but for eagles, who fly thither where the dead body lieth."—Homily concerning the Sacrament.

But greater than the Homilies and all our divines, is the authority of our Liturgy: and this is in perfect agreement with the letter of our Lord's words. We pray the "gracious Lord" to "grant us so to eat the flesh of His dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood:" and the Priest, "when he delivereth the bread and the wine to any one," is directed to say, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee—The Blood of Christ, which was shed for thee."

⁶² Nor in "discoursing of his passion did He mention the Impassible Godhead."—Theodoret in Pusey, p. 674.

* See Appendix W.

⁶³ Very wonderful examples of this may be found in Romanist and Tractarian writers, e.g. Bellarmine, Dr. Newman, and Archdeacon Wilberforce.

God, and yet can also be in thousands of places upon the earth, that it can remain, whole and perfect, in those places, and that it can be in or under innumerable millions of pieces of bread in those places;—all is to no purpose. If these things were proved, it would only be labour in vain; since our Lord speaks not of his glorified body, but of his body given for us and his blood shed for us. He speaks of his dead body, of his body as dead, and not as living or glorified. This it is which his words declare, which He gave the disciples, which He told them to take and eat.

With this interpretation all the ancient Fathers, for hundreds of years, so far as they have touched upon the subject, perfectly agree. Under more than eighty names of writers, “from the time when St. John the evangelist was translated to his Lord, to the date of the Fourth General Council, A.D. 451, a period of three centuries and a half,” Dr. Pusey has recited “authorities—on the Real Objective Presence in the Holy Eucharist:” but he and many will be astonished at the declaration, that I do not find in all the four hundred pages which this part of his work occupies, one single authority which can prove the belief of such a “Real Objective Presence” as he sets forth, “The Real Objective Presence” of our Lord’s glorified body in the Eucharist “under the form of bread and wine.” These authorities prove, undoubtedly and most fully, a real objective presence, in a certain sense, of our Lord’s body and blood, that is, of the things which He called, and ordained to be sacramentally, his body and blood; his body given, and his blood shed: but they supply no evidence of a belief of “The Real Objective Presence,” which Dr. Pusey and his friends so zealously teach.

The true nature and effect of these authorities will be considered in another place. I am here concerned only to speak of their accordance with the conclusion we have reached, that the literal interpretation of our Lord’s words in the institution, is of the given body, of the crucified, slain, dead body, and not of the living, risen, or glorified body.

Now the fact, which may be easily verified by an inspection of them in Dr. Pusey’s work, that none of these authorities speak of our Lord’s glorified body being in the Eucharist, or as objectively present “under the forms of bread and wine;” while they do speak of receiving his flesh, his body, and his blood, is, of itself, a clear proof, that they meant the body, not as glori-

fied or living, but as given, as sacrificed, as dead. They must have meant one or the other, although the body is the same: the body which was born of the Virgin, and was crucified; which also was raised from the dead, was carried up into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God in heaven.—The body, the selfsame, one, identical body; but the conditions different. And where spoken of in one condition, the other condition is not meant, but is necessarily excluded. It is either the body glorified, which was dead; or the body dead, which is glorified. It is in one or other of these states or conditions, the state of death, or the state of glory: it cannot be both.

But in speaking of the flesh and blood of Christ, as in these words of St. Ignatius: “There is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup for the uniting of His Blood, one Altar;” or in these words of St. Justin Martyr: “The Food, over which thanksgiving has been made by the prayer of the word which is from Him (from which food our blood and flesh are by transmutation nourished), is the Flesh and Blood of Him, the Incarnate Jesus:”⁶⁴ the flesh of a living body could not be intended. The Holy Scriptures never speak of the flesh of a sacrifice being eaten, before it is killed: and St. Augustine teaches that to eat the flesh of a living body would be “a heinous wickedness or crime.”⁶⁵ St. Gregory of Nyssa also says, that “it is plain to every one that a sheep would not be eaten by man unless it were first killed for food. He therefore who gave His Body for Food to His disciples, clearly showeth, under the form of a Lamb, that the Sacrifice was perfected. For the body of the victim would not have been fit for food if it had been alive. When therefore He gave His Body for Food, and His Blood for Drink to His disciples, He had already, after an unspeakable and invisible manner, in will, sacrificed His Body by His Power as Dispenser of the mysteries.” Theophylact also says, that no one eats “any body unless it be first killed.”⁶⁶

When, therefore, the ancient Fathers speak of the Body or

⁶⁴ In dealing with the authorities cited by Dr. Pusey, I cite them as they are in his work, to which recourse may be had for references to the originals.—The Doctrine of the Real Presence, pp. 317, 319.

⁶⁵ “Facinus vel flagitium videtur (John vi. 53) jubere: figura est ergo.” Thus he speaks of a human body: and therefore he would have said worse of eating a living human body.—De Doct. Christ. iii. 16.

⁶⁶ Οὐδέis γὰρ ἐσθίει τι, ἐὰν μὴ πρότερον ἐσφαγμένον εἴη.—Comm. in St. Matth. c. xxviii.; Disc. ii. pp. 95, 1826.

Flesh of Christ as our food, or as to be eaten, they mean his body as sacrificed, they mean his dead body.

And again the authorities cited by Dr. Pusey speak throughout of the body and blood of Christ, clearly in the meaning not of his body with the blood in it, circulating and enlivening it, and therefore not shed, but of his body given for us, as given; and his blood shed for us, as poured out from the body, and therefore leaving it dead. They had no notion of such a contradiction as a living, much more a glorified body, the blood being separated and poured out from it: nor of so doubly revolting a thing as eating a living body, or so impossible a thing as the blood being shed from our Lord's glorified body. They would have seen what the advocates of the Roman and Tractarian doctrines strangely fail to see, how utterly inconsistent is "The Real Objective Presence" of our Lord "under the form of bread," with "The Real Objective Presence" of his blood "under the form of wine;" if such a doctrine had been broached among them. They would have abhorred as cannibalism the idea of eating the flesh of a living body; and never thought of receiving the blood in the body, the glorified body, whose blood cannot be shed, while yet they received it by itself, separated from the body. They would have seen the self-evident, but now for centuries the strangely overlooked fact, that a body is necessarily dead if the blood be poured out from it: that the sacrifices died from the shedding of their blood: that, therefore, our Lord Jesus Christ died, when his blood was poured out; and that when we receive his blood shed for us, his body which we receive is therefore dead.

But to come to direct and explicit testimonies of the ancient Fathers. "St. Clement of Alexandria" says: "That rich and fat and abundant and all-sufficing food and delight of the Blessed, 'the fatted Calf,' is sacrificed, who again is also called a Lamb. —To the sons who approach, the Father giveth the Calf and slayeth it, and it is eaten."—"St. James of Nisibis" says: "When His Body was eaten and His Blood drunk, He was 'counted among the dead.'" The "Author of the *De Sacramentis*," commenting on those words of the Psalm, "Thy youth shall be renewed as the eagle's," says: "Good eagles about the altar. For 'where the body is, there too the eagles.' The altar is a figure of the Body, and the Body of Christ is on the altar." "St. Gaudentius of Brescia" says: "In this truth in which we

are, One died for all; and the Same in each house of the Church, in the mystery of bread and wine, being sacrificed, refresheth; believed on, quickeneth; consecrated, sanctifieth the consecrators. This is the Flesh of the Lamb; this His blood.—This sacrifice of the Passover of the Saviour do ye all, going forth from the power of Egypt and of Pharaoh the devil, receive with us with all eagerness of a religious heart.”*

St. Augustine says: “The multitude of all the nations,—has filled the Church, has received of the Lord’s Table not mean viands or ignoble drinks, but the flesh and blood of the Shepherd Himself, of Christ Himself slain.”⁶⁷ St. Chrysostom says: “Thou seest the Lord sacrificed and lying, and the priest standing and praying over the Sacrifice, and all [the people] reddened with that Precious Blood.” He speaks of “the sacred Table—where Christ lies slain.” And again he says: “We too shall this evening see Him Who was nailed on the Cross, as it were a Lamb slain and sacrificed.—Thou seest the Lamb sacrificed and made ready:—thou beholdest the Lamb slain.—Consider what it is that lieth before thee.—He hath set before us Himself sacrificed.” And “St. Cyril of Alexandria” says: “Let us hasten together to the mystic supper. Christ to-day banquets us; Christ to-day ministers to us; Christ, the lover of mankind, refreshes us. Awful is it to say, awful what is wrought. The fatted Calf is sacrificed; the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world is slain.”†

But one of the most remarkable passages is the following from “St. Isaac the Great,” or “The Teacher:”—“I beheld that her cup was mingled, and instead of wine it was full of Blood, and instead of bread, a Body was placed for her in the midst of her table. I saw the Blood and trembled; and the Body, and fear seized me; and she [Faith] made a sign to me, ‘Eat, and be silent; drink, child, and scrutinize not.’—She showed me a Body slain, and placed thereof between my lips, and cried to me sweetly, ‘See what it is thou art eating.’ She gave me the pen of the Spirit, and bade me subscribe; and I took, and wrote, and I confessed, ‘This is the Body of God.’”

To these testimonies from ancient Fathers a few may be sub-

* Dr. Pusey’s *Doctrine of the Real Presence*, pp. 329, 330, 371, 468, 487, 492.

⁶⁷ “Invitata est postea universarum Gentium multitudo, ipsa implevit Ecclesiam, ipsa accepit de mensa dominica non viles epulas, aut ignobiles potus, sed ipsius pastoris, ipsius occisi Christi carnem prælibavit et sanguinem.”—Serm. 372; Migne, v. 1662.

† *Doctrine of the Real Presence*, pp. 545, 551, 556, 557, 568, 493.

joined from divines of the Church of England. Saravia⁶⁸ says : " We have here, according to Irenæus, the two parts which make up the whole nature of the Sacrament, the earthly and the heavenly, namely, the bread and wine, together with the Crucified Body of the Lord, and His blood poured out.—But since this Sacrament be a commemoration of the Death and Passion of the Lord, it followeth that the bread be not to be referred to the Flesh '*simpliciter*,' such as the Flesh is now in glory, but such as it was upon the altar of the Cross ; and in like manner that the wine be to be referred to the Blood ; not that blood which is now in the glorified Body of the Lord, but that which flowed from the wounds of the Body of the Lord. In any other way, how could that be true which is said, ' As often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we do show forth the Lord's death till He come ' ? " ⁶⁹

Bishop Lake asks : " How are His body and blood to be considered ? " and answers the question thus : " Surely not as Christ is glorified, but as He was crucified : for it is that body that was given, and the blood is that blood which was shed. " *

Bishop Cosin writes : " Christ's flesh, not, indeed, simply as it is flesh, without any other respect, (for so it is not given, neither would it profit us,) but as it is crucified, and *given* for the redemption of the world.—He that doth it worthily receives his absolution and justification,—that is, he that *discerns*, and then receives the Lord's body as torn, and His blood as shed, for the redemption of the world. " †

Thorndike says : " If the consecrated elements be the Flesh and Blood of Christ, then are they the sacrifice of Christ crucified upon the cross. For they are not the Flesh and Blood of Christ as in His body, while it was whole ; but as separated by the passion of His cross. ' ‡

And Archbishop Wake says : " The body we receive in this

⁶⁸ Adrian Saravia, Canon of Canterbury, the friend of Hooker. His work *On the Holy Eucharist*, was published with a translation by Archdeacon Denison, 1855.

⁶⁹ " *Secundum Irenæi sententiam hic duas habemus partes quibus tota sacramenti natura perficitur, terrenam et cœlestem ; nempe, panem et vinum eum Corpore Domini crucifixo et Sanguine Ipsius fuso. Quum autem hoc sacramentum sit mortis et passionis Domini commemoratio, consequitur panem non referri ad carnem simpliciter, qualis nunc est in gloria, sed qualis fuit in ara Crucis : similiter et vinum referri ad Sanguinem, non eum qui nunc est in glorificato Domini Corpore, sed fluentem e vulneribus Corporis Domini. Alias, quomodo verum esset, ' Quoties manducamus hunc panem et poculum bibimus, nos annunciare mortem Domini donec veniat ? ' " —Pp. 22, 40. It would be worth the reader's while to follow Saravia's argument, in which he will find many passages which might be fitly added to those given above.*

* *Serm. on Matt. xxvi. 26–28 ; Sermons, 1629.*

† *Hist. of Transubstantiation, I. vi. and IV. v.*

‡ *Just Weights and Measures, XIV. vii., Oxford, 1854, v. 174.*

holy sacrament is his crucified body; his body given for us; his blood shed for us; which can never be verified in his present glorified body.—It was the design of this sacrament to exhibit and communicate to us the body and blood of Christ, not any way, but in the state of his suffering; as He was given for us, and became a sacrifice for our sins.”*

These testimonies from ancient Fathers and from our own divines are sufficient for the purpose of confirming the interpretation that the flesh or body, and the blood of our Lord, received in the Eucharist, are the body given to God in sacrifice, the slain and dead body; and the blood poured out: and are not the glorified body, or the blood belonging to it, which cannot be shed. Our Lord’s words themselves declare this; and the notion of the glorified body is altogether foreign to them. It was the invention of a late age, from a false view of the Sacrament; and from the time of its invention until now it has effected a complete change in the doctrine of the Eucharist. I cannot trace it to an earlier date than the twelfth century, when “Honorius, of Autun,” speaking of dividing the Host into three parts, declared that “That which is put into the Cup is the glorified body of our Lord, and that which the priest eats is the Body of Jesus Christ,” the Church. He appears also to have said, “That when the Bread is put into the Wine it is represented that the Soul of our Lord returned into his body.”†

Some had said before that the bread and wine, after consecration, were “the Body itself of our Lord deified,” and that “the Bread of the Sacrament was joined to the Divinity.”‡ And this opinion seems to have been proposed as a proof that the elements are not types, antitypes, or figures: but are “one and the same thing” with our Lord’s body. But the notion of the glorified body in the Eucharist seems to have followed upon the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as the way in which the difficulties of that doctrine were to be surmounted.

It would be a waste of words to add anything more for the purpose of showing that the strictly literal interpretation of our Lord’s words in the institution, is neither more nor less

* Principles of the Christian Religion Explained, Lond., 1827, pp. 364, 365.

† L’Arroque, II. xviii. pp. 468, 466.

‡ Ibid. xii. pp. 366, 367.

than that which they exactly and most clearly express,—namely, that the words, “This is my body which is given for you,” mean, “This bread is my body which is being given for you;” and the words, “This is my blood which is shed for you,” mean, “This cup is my blood which is being shed for you:” the tenses of the participles most clearly denoting the condition of the body and the blood. It is not his body which has been given, but is now living: but his body which is being given, his body now in a sacrificial condition, now slain and dead. Nor is it his blood which has been shed, or, as the Church of Rome, in defiance of the letter, has it, shall be shed; but his blood which is being shed, is now being poured out in sacrifice, and thus leaves the body in the condition of death.

It must now be abundantly manifest that the Roman, Lutheran, and Tractarian interpretations do not give “the proper and most plain, the most simple and grammatical signification, or the simple and natural sense;” and that they set forth not that “which the words exactly convey,” but much more than they convey or will bear; and in fact impose upon the words a meaning irreconcilable with their plain signification.

It has been necessary to bring to the reader’s recollection what the words really are which are to be interpreted, and upon which the whole doctrine depends: that they are not merely, as Archdeacon Wilberforce propounds them, “This is my body; This is my blood;” but that they are, “This is my body which is given for you; This is my blood which is shed for you.” It has been shown that the copula has been changed in the interpretations, arguments, and doctrines of the advocates of “The Real Objective Presence:” and that to state the predicates to be “my body,” and “my blood,” is to misstate them. All arguments, therefore, founded upon such misstatements are necessarily and utterly fallacious, and nothing but false doctrine can result from them.

It has been shown also, that not only are the propositions to be examined, thus misstated; but that one of them is in reality quite left out of the account. Recited, indeed, it is, but it is treated as if it had no meaning, or as if the meaning of it were identical with the meaning of the other proposition. Archdeacon Wilberforce asks his readers to consider the propositions, “This is my body; This is my blood:” and after his logical dissection of these propositions, the enquiry immediately proceeds,

and is carried on to its results, without any recollection of the second proposition, beyond repeating it occasionally, with no more influence on the argument than a mere expletive. In fact, the proposition "This is my blood," has no place in the doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence:" the whole doctrine being deduced and flowing from these four words only, "This is my body."

And this observation will be found to be true with regard to innumerable works which for centuries have been written on this subject. "Hoc est corpus meum," "This is my body," has been for ages the text, the only real text on which hosts of learned and able men have written; the sum and substance of their arguments and conclusions. They have wasted millions of pages on the possibility, the conditions, and the consequences of its accomplishment; while they have failed to recognise our Lord's proposition in its entirety, overlooked its true and literal significance, and the bearing of the other proposition upon it; and have, in reality treated the words "This is my blood which is shed for you" as if they had no distinct meaning of their own, and had no influence upon the true doctrine of the Sacrament.

I must not be understood as insinuating that the writers, to whom I have alluded, were or are conscious of this practical mutilation of our Lord's words; I think that many would be exceedingly surprised and grieved at the truth of my allegations. They would agree with me that all the words and the circumstances under which they were uttered must be taken into consideration, and that each must be allowed its full weight, to find the true doctrine of the Eucharist: and I think that they would, one and all, be in consternation at finding that they had in reality founded their doctrine on those four words only, "This is my body," to the entire forgetfulness of all the rest; and by some unconscious sleight of imagination changing this proposition into others totally different, as: "This has my body," or "the presence of my body, in, with, or under it, or under its species." It is truly amazing to see how numbers of good men, of the highest capacities and most profound learning, have unconsciously practised this deceit upon themselves; and how they have misread the ancient Fathers, whose doctrine was in perfect agreement with the exact words of our Lord, "This is my body given; This is my blood shed;" and have taken and proposed their testimony, as if it demonstrated those

other very different propositions. But this is to be spoken of more fully in another place.

The strictly literal interpretation of our Lord's words having been thus developed and vindicated, we have now to consider how, and to what extent, they are affected by the circumstances under which they were uttered, and were then fulfilled.

The consideration of the reader, then, is to be directed to this circumstance; that our Lord's body was external to the bread and wine, of which He said that they were his body and his blood: that He, his body and his blood, was as really and as much external to the bread and wine as to the apostles, or to any other thing on the table. Although, therefore, He was present, so to speak, to the bread and wine, there was no real presence of his body and blood in or under them. It would be an outrage on faith and understanding to assert, that while our Lord was sitting there at the table, unquestionably and to the certain and infallible knowledge of his disciples, personally and bodily; He was yet, Himself, body, and soul, and Divinity, really, truly, and substantially, in the elements or under their species, instead of their own substance, or united with it. And yet this is what the Roman, the Lutheran, and the Tractarian doctrines of "The Real Objective Presence" must involve.

I do not forget that a very high authority among the Fathers spoke of our Lord holding Himself in his own hands; but this he spoke in a very different sense, as he himself explained.

Then, again, it is to be considered, that just as our Lord was not really present in the elements; if there was not, and could not be, a real substantial presence of his body in the bread, or of his blood in the wine, which He distributed to the twelve; if the living body was not and could not be in or under the elements or their forms: so also the dead body, of which alone He spoke, was not and could not be in the bread or under its form, nor the outpoured blood in the wine or under its form. For it is another circumstance of the institution, which has a most important bearing on the words, that when our Lord gave his body broken and his blood shed, his body was not broken, and his blood was not shed. His body was not in the condition which the words "given" or "broken" mean: his blood was not in the condition which the word "shed" means. Therefore, the dead body could not be present in the bread, and the outpoured blood could not be present in the wine: for there can be no

real substantial presence of that which is not; a reason which applies to the presence alike of the glorified, and of the dead, body at the institution.

And now to restate the literal meaning of the words of the institution of the Eucharist, as distinguished from the glosses which have for centuries been put upon them, and as illustrated and limited by the circumstances under which they were spoken:—it must be noted that in the words, “This is my body; This is my blood,” the first “This” meant the bread which the Lord took and gave;⁷⁰ and the second “This” meant the wine which He took and gave. The letter allows of no other meanings. These pronouns were demonstrative of no other things than the bread and wine. They meant not some indefinite thing under the species, nor any substance into which the elements had been converted, nor any substance which had displaced the substance of the elements: because the things were not indefinite, nor did the letter involve any change or displacement of substance in the things to which these pronouns referred.

Our Lord took the bread, and took the wine, the fruit of the vine. He took bread and wine only, and of this bread and wine only did He speak, after He had blessed them, when He said “This is my body, This is my blood.” And what He said must be the truth. What He said the bread was and the wine was, that He meant them to be: and what He meant, He was able to make them. What He said, therefore, of the bread and the wine, that they were, in such manner and in such sense as his purpose required. He who made the worlds, by whom all things consist, and all things shall be made new, said it, and ordained it. It was not the faith of the apostles, nor their participation, which made the elements to be what our Lord said they were: for He said it before they received: He said it, and what He said was true, before they could believe it. It was his will and power only which made them to be what He said they were.

Of the bread, then, it was that our Lord said, “This is my body;” and of the wine also it was that He said, “This is my blood.” He said not “This signifies,” as the Zuinglian doctrine would have it: nor “This contains, this has in it, or under its

⁷⁰ This is conclusively determined by the words: “This cup is the New Testament in my blood,” Luke xxii, 20: 1 Cor. xi. 25, for both propositions must be interpreted in the same way.

form," as the Church of Rome has it: nor "This has with it," as the Lutheran doctrine has it: nor "This has in it, or under its form, the real objective presence of:—my body—my blood:" but He said, "This is my body, This is my blood." He said not of the bread, "This contains," or "This has in it, or with it, or under its form," or "This has in it the presence of, my glorified body:" but He said, "This is my body which is being given for you." Nor did He speak only of the bread: He spoke also of the wine, and said, "This is my blood which is being shed for you." And He gave the bread by itself, and the wine by itself; the body and the blood separately from each other: showing by the act, as well as denoting by the words, that it was the body deprived of life—his dead body which He gave. It was his body being given in sacrifice for sin, and it was his blood poured out for the making of that sacrifice, which He gave: for He said, "My body which is given," and "my blood which is shed for you." And giving the body and the blood separately from each other, He showed that the sacrifice was completed, and that the body was dead.

But his body was not dead, nor was his blood shed. He gave his body dead, while it was as yet living and unhurt: He gave his blood shed, while it was yet circulating in full, vivifying current in his veins.

And though He gave his dead body, while his body was living, and his outpoured blood, while it was not poured out: his words were true, and his action was in truth. The words were no mere figure: the act was no mere representation. The words were as literal as those words He had spoken once before: "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life;" and by the act He gave his "flesh," which "is meat indeed, and" his "blood," which "is drink indeed,"* as really and as truly as it was necessary to receive them.

Now, since our Lord said of the bread, "This is my body;" the bread was his body: and since He said of the wine, "This is my blood;" the wine was his blood: for He spoke truth; "The words that I speak unto you," He had before said, "they are spirit and they are truth." Since He said of the bread, "This is my body which is being given for you;" the bread was his body being given: since He said of the wine, "This is my blood which is being shed for you;" the wine was his blood

* John vi. 44, 45.

being poured out of his body: and since He gave his body and his blood separately from each other; the gift and sacrifice of his body was completed, and the body was dead. Since his body was not in the bread or under its form, and his blood was not in the wine or under its form; the bread was not his body in fact, neither did it contain his body: and the wine was not his blood in fact, neither did it contain his blood. And since He gave his body broken, when it was not in fact broken; and since He gave his blood shed, when it was not in fact shed: and yet He did give his dead body and his outpoured blood in all necessary truth and reality: it follows that the bread was the body of our Lord, and the wine was his blood, by his will and all-powerful word, in a mystery, by effectual substitution and representation, in spiritual and life-giving power: but not in literal fact. So far as one thing can be another; so far as bread can be the body of Christ given for us, and wine can be his blood shed for us; so far as the bread and the wine can be that which is not anywhere in the world, in heaven, or on earth; so far, and so far only, is the bread his body and the wine his blood, and so far only did He intend them to be.

Such was the Eucharist at its first celebration; and ever since the words have been as true; and the act of his ministers has been in equal truth: the words true, and the act in truth, neither more nor less, from the first speaking and the first doing of them until now; and so shall they be till He come again.

The words were true when He gave his body broken, while it was not broken; and when He gave his outpoured blood, while it was not yet shed; and they are true now at this present time; they have all along been true; and to the end of the world they will be true: notwithstanding that He is no longer in the condition of a sacrifice, has taken his life again, has ascended into heaven, and is for ever sat down at the right hand of God. His words are alike true before his passion and in his glory. The bread in the Eucharist is the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the wine is his blood, in the self-same sense, in the self-same degree, and in the self-same way, at this present moment as they were before He suffered.

CHAPTER XI.

ONE AND THE SAME GIFT IN THE EUCHARIST FROM THE FIRST.

It has been represented, and I find it is thought by some, that in the first Eucharist, our Lord did not impart the same gift, or did not impart an equal measure of the same gift, to the apostles, as He now vouchsafes to us. Bishop Moberley, in his "Sayings of the great Forty Days," has the following wonderful disquisition. "It is most remarkable, that among the (not many) passages which, in the whole Scriptures, attach the mysterious Presence of Christ in his Church to the Ascension, there is one, and that among the most signal of them, which particularly combines the Sacred Presence in the Eucharist with the same event. For when the disciples, after the great Communion discourse in the sixth of St. John, said, 'This is an hard saying; who can bear it? When Jesus knew in Himself that his disciples murmured at it, He said unto them, Doth this offend you? If, then, ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life!' Herein He points directly to the Ascension, as 'that day' in which they should no longer find the saying hard in which they had been taught the vital need of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood. Thus even the spiritual food of the Body and Blood of Christ, the very aliment of the union that is betwixt Christ and his Church, waited for the ascension of the flesh before it was fully offered to the sacred touch of the faithful in communion. Then, indeed, the Church should touch; touch and be touched; touch the true Body and Blood of her ascended Lord, to strengthen her indwelling grace, to confirm her unity in the Lord, to be assured of the grace and good-will of God, to receive cleansing, holiness, and immortality both of body and soul. The feast, indeed, was instituted, and eleven had partaken of it, while the Sacrifice was in the midst; but thenceforth, He drank no more of that

fruit of the vine, till He drank it new with them in his Father's kingdom."

I forbear a minute examination of this statement: but I have to ask what foundation is there for the assertion, that "the spiritual food of the Body and Blood of Christ—waited for the ascension of the flesh before it was . . . fully offered . . . to the sacred touch of the faithful in communion"? This necessarily implies that this "spiritual food" was not "fully offered" to the apostles by our Lord in his own personal ministrations. But He said to them, "This is my body—This is my blood:" and He says the very same to us now. He says no more to us than He said to them: and the meaning of the words at the first must be the same as it has been ever since. The apostles received that which He gave: and He gave his body which was being given for them, his blood which was being shed for them. Nor can we conceive any fuller offering to us of this gift. It is the same one body which He offered at first, and offers now to his people. He gave no other body: and He gave it, not in parts, though broken. Nor did He give some of his blood, but all.

Mediæval and modern doctrine, indeed, cuts up the words, and in reality casts some of them away. For in representing our Lord's glorified body, in "Real Objective Presence," as the gift to us in the Holy Communion, that doctrine does, to all real intents and purposes, cut off and cast away the words, "which is given for you," and not only these, but also, the words "This is my blood which is shed for you:" and it is only by the allegation of the glorified body, and by the virtual substitution of the word "glorified" for all those other words in giving the cup as well as the bread, that the Body and Blood of Christ are conceived to be "more fully offered" since his ascension than before.

Archdeacon Wilberforce expressed a similar opinion, but apparently from a different reason. He said: "On our Lord's Ascension, his Disciples returned to Jerusalem to wait for that gift of the Holy Ghost, which was shortly to be dispensed. It had been declared to be the work of the Blessed Comforter to provide some new and closer means of union with that manhood of the Son, which was to be withdrawn from mortal sense. By this means He who in appearance departed, was in reality to be brought more near. The new Head of the renewed race,

the second Adam of reformed humanity, was about to provide that principle of supernatural union whereby all his members were to be engrafted into Himself. Now, it is through the Holy Communion that this connection is especially maintained. Its great purpose is to bring the members of Christ into mystic union with their Head. Thereby does the manhood of Christ act upon his brethren. In this circumstance surely we have the reason why, during that first assemblage at Jerusalem, no mention is made of an observance, which so soon as the Holy Ghost had bestowed the fulness of His gifts, became the main act of Christian worship. 'These all continued in one accord with prayer and supplication.' But no sooner had the life-giving medium been bestowed, than 'they continued in *breaking of bread*, and in prayer.' The Holy Communion, it seems, could not have effect, till the pouring out of that quickening spirit, by which the members of Christ mystical are attached to their Head."*

I do not perceive what the Archdeacon alluded to in the words: "It had been declared to be the work of the Blessed Comforter to provide some new and closer means of union with that manhood of the Son." But by that "new and closer means of union" is clearly intended, "the Holy Communion, through which this connection is especially maintained:" and in regard to the Holy Communion, the writer said, that "the new Head of the renewed race,—was,"—as the context here intimates,—while the Disciples stayed at Jerusalem "to wait for that gift of the Holy Spirit,—about to provide that principle of supernatural union whereby all his members were to be engrafted into Himself." So, to put these wonderful statements together in proper order, our Lord, after his Ascension, provided the principle, and the Holy Spirit, after his descent at Pentecost, provided a "new and closer means," than before had been provided, of union between the members of Christ and their Head; and this means was the Holy Communion. If this be not the true meaning of the place, I cannot conceive what other meaning it will bear: but if it be the true meaning, it is quite enough to point it out. The institution of the Eucharist by our Lord Himself, the night before He suffered appears to be ignored, or perhaps passed over as but a shadow: the "principle" and the "means" were to be provided, when the Spirit should be given. They were not yet provided while

* The Doctrine of the Incarnation, c. xiii. ii. pp. 452, 453.

the disciples waited for that gift. Such is the effect, as it appears to me, of this amazing statement.

It might be, indeed, that the gift in the Sacrament did not bear its full, or so much, fruit, until the Holy Spirit was given: but He in whom the Spirit dwelt, and who, breathing on his disciples, said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," must be believed to have been "not wanting to his Sacrament," from the first.

Thus, however, though from apparently different reasons, the Bishop and the Archdeacon are to be understood as setting forth either a fuller or a different gift in the Eucharist, than that which our Lord Himself imparted in person to his disciples.

A Romanist writer gets over the inconsistency and many other difficulties, by the bold assertion, that "in fact, the body which Christ gave was by anticipation his glorified body, which was *capable of being in many places at once*, and had other qualities which our bodies will also possess when they shall have put on incorruption and immortality."*

I know not whether many have received this notion of a fuller or different gift subsequent to the institution; although with some to whom the anticipation of the glorified body at the institution may appear to be an anachronism, and logically inconsistent with "The Real Objective Presence" at that time, it will be taken for certain truth, that after the Lord Jesus was glorified, a gift was offered in the Eucharist different from the gift offered at the institution; or if it were the same gift, that it was "more fully offered" in consequence of the Ascension. But from regard to the influence of the Bishop's and the Archdeacon's authority, I must bring forward some countervailing testimonies.

St. Augustine certainly did not imagine any difference between the first Eucharist, and the Eucharists which succeeded our Lord's Ascension and the descent of the Holy Spirit. He writes: "He gave His Supper, He gave His Passion."—His words, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," are "a figure commanding us to communicate in the Lord's passion, and sweetly and usefully

* Husenbeth's Defence against Blanco White, 1826, p. 79.

to lay up in our memory that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us.”—“He gave to the disciples the Supper consecrated with His own hands: but we have not sat down in that banquet; and yet we daily eat the Supper itself by faith.—Paul was not there who believed, Judas was there who betrayed. How many now too in this same Supper, though they saw not then that table, nor beheld with their eyes, nor tasted with their mouths, the bread which the Lord carried in His hands, yet because it is the same (*ipsa*) which is now prepared, how many now also in this same Supper, eat and drink judgment to themselves!”⁷¹

St. Chrysostom says: “This table is the same as that, and hath nothing less.” “The first table had no advantage above that which cometh after it. For even to-day also it is He who doeth all, and delivered it even as then.—Believe therefore, that even now it is that Supper at which He Himself sits down. It is the same which Christ gave to His disciples, and which the Priests now minister. This is no wise inferior to that, because it is not men that sanctify even this, but the same who sanctified the one sanctifies the other also.”* “Of His own Flesh He hath granted us our fill. He hath set before us Himself sacrificed. What excuse shall we have then, if, when feeding on such food, we commit such sins? It is always a Passion.”†

It seems that St. Chrysostom thought it necessary to show that the Eucharist celebrated by the ministry of men, was in no respect inferior to that which was celebrated by our Lord Himself. He had no thought of a higher or fuller gift by their ministrations.

Of divines of the Reformed Church of England, I will cite only Archbishop Bramhall and Bishop Jeremy Taylor. The Archbishop says: “They who are ordained Priests ought to have power to consecrate the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, that is, to make them present after such manner as they

⁷¹ “Cœnam suam dedit, passionem suam dedit: ille saturatur, qui imitatur.”—Enar. in Ps. xxi. 24, al. xxii. 27. “Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni Dominicæ, communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter reconduendum in memoria quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit.”—De Doctr. Christiana, III. xvi. “Cœnam manibus suis consecratam discipulis dedit; sed nos in illo convivio non discubimus; et tamen ipsam cœnam fide quotidie manducamus.—Non ibi fuit Paulus qui credidit; ibi fuit Judas qui tradidit. Quam multi et modo in ipsa cœna, quamvis illam tunc mensam non viderint, nec panem quem Dominus gestavit in manibus, oculis suis aspexerint, vel faucibus gustaverint: tamen quia ipsa est quæ nunc preparatur, quam multi etiam nunc in ipsa cœna judicium sibi manducant et bibunt!” Serm. cxii. c. iv. Luc. xiv.; Migne iv. 178, iii. 74, 75, v. 645.

* Hom. 82; Matt. xxvi. 34; Hom. 27; 1 Cor. xi. 24; Hom. 2.; 2 Tim. i. 12; Lib. Aug. Cath. Theol. pp. 1092, 377, 184.

† Dr. Pusey's Doctrine of the Real Presence, pp. 568, 595.

were present at the first institution.”* And Bishop Taylor says that “the blessed Sacrament is the same thing now as it was in the institution of it.”

I may add two places from Archdeacon Wilberforce’s work on the Eucharist, from which it may be gathered that he had changed or modified his opinion, as above cited from his earlier work. He says: “When our Lord spoke of His Body and Blood as bestowed upon His disciples in this Sacrament, He must have been understood to imply that He Himself, Godhead, Soul, and Body was the gift communicated.”—“As He then gave it Himself to His twelve apostles, so He still communicates it by the ministration of their successors to the faithful, in the Holy Eucharist.—That which our Lord did in person at His last Supper, He has done ever since by the medium of His ministers. Through them does He still bestow that gift of His Body and His Blood, which He gave to His twelve apostles. He still speaks the words of Institution, and thereby affirms the presence of Himself, of His Body, Soul, and Godhead.” †

Thus the Archdeacon represents the same gift equally offered at the institution, and in all subsequent time. But since, in the Archdeacon’s doctrine, the gift in all subsequent time is the glorified body of Christ, this amounts to an assertion that our Lord gave his glorified body, even before He suffered. And as his body was not at that time glorified, it could only be said to be given “by” Mr. Husenbeth’s figure of “anticipation;” which is as much as to say that it was not given in reality: and then if the gift be the very same at the institution and subsequently, it would follow that it is no more given in reality now.

But the assertion that the gift at the institution, or in subsequent time, was our Lord’s glorified body, is irreconcilable with his own words: for He said “This is my body which is being given for you:” and it absolutely ignores, as the doctrine of “The Real Objective Presence” does ignore, the fact that the true, the very true, real body of our Lord, though present to the bread and wine, was external to them, as much as it was external to the apostles or anything else that was there: and was really present in its substance no more in the bread and wine than in the twelve. Indeed if we remember the words:

* Consecration of Protestant Bishops Vindicated, Disc. V. i.; Lib. Ang. Cath. Theol. iii. 165.

† Chap. iv. pp. 91, 94, 111.

“ I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one : ” we must acknowledge a spiritual presence in his disciples, which our Lord never predicated of the bread or wine in his holy Supper.

For this notion of a fuller or a different gift in the Eucharist subsequently to the institution, I cannot find or conceive any Scriptural ground. There is nothing throughout the New Testament to intimate, that the Eucharist was one thing before our Lord’s passion, and another thing after his resurrection or ascension ; or that, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, another or a fuller presence is imparted to the elements, or communicated to the faithful, than when the Sacrament was ministered by our Lord Himself. We have, it must be asserted, absolutely no right to imagine, that whereas neither our Lord Himself nor his body was really and substantially present in the bread, nor his blood really and substantially present in the wine, which He gave to the apostles before He suffered ; yet now, they are so present. We have not the shadow of authority in holy Scripture for imagining that He Himself is really, personally, and substantially present in the elements by virtue of any powers which his body, living, or risen, or glorified, may be supposed to have had or to have now. It is the self-same institution, the same Sacrament, having the same outward signs, the same spiritual grace. The Eucharist which the Church has ever celebrated since the ascension of our Lord to glory, and since the gift of his Spirit, is the self-same as that which He Himself ministered before his passion. We have not a hint in Scripture or in the ancient Fathers of any other gift, or any fuller gift, than the apostles received at the first : nor are we entitled to believe that there is any other presence of our Lord in the elements now, than there was in the elements which He Himself consecrated and gave.

That when and since the Holy Spirit was given, the faithful may have enjoyed larger benefits, a fuller and deeper perception, a more spiritual appreciation, a stronger faith, more vivid and heavenly hope, more fervent charity, as the fruits of communion, may be, and no doubt is, true : but the grace and gift has been always the same : the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given, his blood which was shed, for us, was that which the apostles received ; and we can receive it no more fully, in no higher degree, in no other manner, in no other condition.

We have seen, then, that, at the institution of the Eucharist, and its ministration by our Lord Himself, the bread was not a mere sign or representation of his body, nor the wine a mere sign or representation of his blood : that the bread did not contain his body, or “the presence of his body,” and the wine did not contain his blood, or “the presence of his blood ;” that the elements had no such presence in or with them, or under their form : that the bread was his body being given to God for sin, and the wine was his blood poured out for sin : that He gave his body and his blood separately from each other ; that the sacrifice of his body was thus perfected, and his body was therefore dead : that his body was not dead, nor his blood poured out : that he nevertheless gave his dead body and his poured out blood : and, consequently, we have seen, that the bread and wine were his body and blood, not in fact, but in a mystery, in all necessary truth and reality, by effectual substitution, in spiritual and life-giving power.

This is the true spiritual sense of the words, “This is my body which is given for you, This is my blood which is shed for you.” It is the only sense which could have been intended ; the sense which the strictly literal interpretation demonstrates and establishes ; the only sense with which it can be reconciled.

We have seen also, that this Holy Sacrament has remained without change in its institution or character, ever since its first celebration. And it may here be added to the remarks which have been made above on this point, that our Lord Himself delivered the institution to St. Paul in the very same words with which He had first celebrated it : and that St. Paul in his turn delivered it in like manner to the Corinthians : “I have received of the Lord,” he says, “that which I also delivered unto you.”* And it must necessarily follow from this, that wherever the apostle preached throughout the Gentile world, he celebrated and delivered the Sacrament in the same way and in the same sense. And not only this ; but it would moreover appear, from the care which he took by conference with the authorities at Jerusalem,† to guard against any real difference from them, that the Church in Jerusalem and in Judæa followed the same course. All the apostles had received the same as St. Paul, and as he delivered to those amongst whom he ministered the very same thing which he had “received of the Lord ;” so undeniably must all the other apostles have done. Thus it is

* 1 Cor. xi. 23.

† Gal. ii. 1, 2.

seen, that throughout the whole Church, the Sacrament was, for a number of years, the same as at its original celebration.

And since no fresh revelation has been made respecting it, and no change has been made by Him who ordained it: it is the same now as when it was first celebrated. It is celebrated according to his word, who said, "Do this in remembrance of me," and it must be so celebrated therefore "till He come," till his presence shall do away remembrance. It is celebrated with the same elements; it is celebrated with the same words, and these words have the same sense which they had when first spoken: the true interpretation of them is always the same: and it has the same grace, neither more nor less; "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for us, his blood which was shed for us."

Since, then, it was his dead body, which our Lord gave, it is his dead body which He gives now: since, in giving that which was not, He gave in a mystery; so now, in giving that which is not, He gives also in a mystery. As there was no presence then, nor could be, of that which was not: there can be no presence now of that which is not. Our Lord's body is not now in the condition which the word "given" or "broken" means: nor is his blood in the condition which the word "shed" means. It was not his glorified body which He gave. If He gave his glorified body, He gave his glorified blood: but He gave his body and his blood separate from each other, and the glorified body and blood cannot be, or conceived to be, separate without making shipwreck of the faith. To make it the glorified body which is now given, is, therefore, to make a Sacrament entirely different from that which He ordained. To speak, then, of the presence of the Lord's glorified body, and to speculate on the possibility of its presence, is to speak of that which He did not speak of, and to be wise in despite of faith. He said nothing, and promised nothing, of his glorified body. It was his body given, and his blood poured out of it, which He spake of: and to this we are tied.

Some, indeed, maintain as a reason to prove the necessity of a real presence in or with the elements, or under their form, of the body and blood of Christ; that since we must "verily and indeed" receive this body and blood, and since we do so receive them, "they must be there, in order that we may receive them." These are Dr. Pusey's words.* And intuitively feeling the

* The Presence of Christ, &c., p. 22.

impossibility of our Lord's broken body and outpoured blood being present: and taking for granted the possibility of his glorified body being present from capacities and powers supposed to belong to it; and taking also for granted our inability to prove the impossibility of its presence: he concludes that he has demonstrated the fulfilment of our need and of our Lord's promise, the "Real Objective Presence" of his body as it is now glorified in heaven.

He and they who think with him are devoutly and rightly impressed with the necessity declared by our Lord Himself, of eating his flesh and drinking his blood. They consider, and rightly consider, that this eating and drinking must be done in very truth, whatsoever may be the way in which He would vouchsafe to feed us with this "most precious food:" and that we must, not in mere figure or representation, but "verily and indeed" be partakers of it. But, as it seems to me, they have forgotten or misconceived, the cautions, that "the letter killeth," that "the flesh profiteth nothing," and that "it is the spirit that giveth life;" when they imagine that this eating and drinking must be literally, though under forms, and so, as they will have it, spiritually: and that a literal, real, substantial presence of the Lord's body and blood "under the forms of the bread and wine," is absolutely necessary for that purpose. And they forget, too, that if the conception of eating his glorified body were possible, it is an outrage against the Catholic faith, to imagine either the eating of his glorified body, or the drinking of the blood. We cannot in faith eat the glorified body, neither can we drink its blood.

Dr. Forbes, Bishop of Brechin, has a similar assertion: he says: "If the blessed Sacrament be really what we believe it to be; if the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful, that Body and that Blood, in some supernatural mode, must be there really, to be so taken."* And even Hooker, I must think incautiously, said that "Christ's incarnation and passion can be available to no man's good which is not made partaker of Christ, neither can we participate of Him without His presence."† And from this alleged necessity of our Lord's presence, in order to our participation of his flesh and blood, it is considered that He, in his human nature, is, truly, really, and substantially in the elements, through which He has ordained that we are to partake of his flesh and blood. And this his presence in the

* Primary Charge, 1857.

† Eccl. Polity, v. 10.

body is supposed to be, as it could only be, from some capacities, some godlike powers, of his body in its present glorified state. So this presence of the glorified body, of whole Christ, of the whole Person of the incarnate Lord, is conceived to be the intention of his words: and consequently they are handled and interpreted as it has been shown they are by the advocates of "The Real Objective Presence." To me, I must confess, however painful it be to say it, the statement that the Body and Blood of our Lord "must be there, in order that we may receive them;" that is, that Christ our God must be under, in, or with, the bread and wine or their forms, in order that we may be partakers of his Body and Blood, seems to savour very strongly of rationalism. It is not of faith, for that is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen;" of things that are now, that have been, or shall be; of things present, or absent; of things that have been, and never can be again; that are not, nor ever have been, but shall be. And to this faith, no presence *there* is necessary. It is strange, too, that the glaring inconsistency is not perceived between claiming for our Lord's body the power of being present in many places on earth and in heaven at the same time, and yet conceiving it so subject to the laws of material things, that it cannot be received, except it be present.

And indeed, after all, what is the Presence, as it is supposed to be? To what is our Lord supposed to be present in the body? The doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence" has it, present in and to the elements of bread and wine or their forms. But they show no signs of his Presence. His body and blood are not present to our sight, they are not present to our feeling; they are not present to our taste; they are not present to any of our senses. If they be present, it is only to our imagination or our faith. And to these all things which can be imagined or believed, can be present, effectually and to all purposes, as much as, and often are more present than, things which we can see, and taste, and feel. So it was with martyrs in the fire. So it was with St. Paul, when "none of those things moved him." Faith can range back into the past or forward into the future: it can dive into the depths below; or ascend into the heights above, and be verily and indeed partaker of what the Lord has promised. And his promise is the only ground of our faith in this matter: for the word of God is the only true ground of faith. If, therefore, the promise does not go before, it is not faith which guides, but

imagination. And to faith there is no such necessity of our Lord's presence, or of the presence of his body and blood, in, with, or under the bread and wine, or their forms, as is thus taken for certain and for granted.

The bearing of the preceding investigation and arguments upon the doctrine of "The Real Presence" is obvious. It has been shown that by the literal interpretation of our Lord's words at the institution of his Holy Supper, it is his dead body and his poured-out blood, which He gave, and which the apostles therefore received. It has been shown that He gave his body separately, and his blood separately; one not joined with or contained in the other: and that therefore, again, it was his dead body which He gave. It has been shown that his body was not in or under the elements or their species, or joined with them; but was external to them: that his living body, though present to the elements, was present to them only as it was present to the disciples, and was not present in them; and that there neither was, nor could be, any presence of his given body in the bread, or of his poured-out blood in the wine, inasmuch also as his body was not yet given, and his blood was not yet shed. It has been shown that He gave that which in fact was not, and therefore gave it "not in the letter, but in spirit and in truth." And it has been shown that we have no other or greater Sacrament than that which our Lord Himself instituted: and that although "He has entered into his glory," and has sent his Holy Spirit to be with his Church, He gives no greater gift in the Eucharist now, than that which He gave the night before He suffered, when He said, "This is my body which is being given for you, This is my blood which is being shed for you."

But it has been shown, that the doctrine of "The Real Presence," as it is professed by the Romanist, the Lutheran, and the Tractarian, is different from this. And a brief comparison will now show still more clearly how great the difference is.

Our Lord gave his body broken for us: Rome and the others say, it is his body glorified; and not this only, but his Soul and Godhead. Our Lord gave his body and his blood separate from each other: the doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence" has it, that He gives his body and his blood together. Our Lord gave his body and his blood separated from each other by

death: Rome and the others have it, that He gives his living body, his body and his blood joined together in life. Our Lord's body was not contained in the bread or under its species; his blood was not contained in the wine or under its species: Rome says that his body is contained under the species of the bread, and his blood under the species of the wine. Our Lord's body was not joined with the bread; his blood was not joined with the wine: the Lutheran says that his body is joined with the bread, and his blood joined with the wine. There was no presence of our Lord's body in the bread; there was no presence of his blood in the wine: the Tractarian says that there is a "Real Objective Presence" of his body in the bread, and of his blood in the wine. And the Romanist, the Lutheran, and the Tractarian doctrines have it, that his body and his blood are present both in the bread and in the wine, or with the bread and the wine, or under the species of bread and wine.

Thus the Romanist, the Lutheran, and the Tractarian, doctrine contradicts our Lord's words, and contravenes his action. It says, it is not our Lord's body broken: it says, it is not our Lord's blood shed: it says, it is not our Lord's body in death: it says, it is not our Lord's body and blood separately from each other.

And again, our Lord said of the bread, "This is my body which is given for you;" and of the wine, "This is my blood which is shed for you:" but the Roman doctrine has it; "This, or the species of this, contains my body and my blood, glorified:" the Lutheran has it; "This has with it my glorified body:" and the Tractarian has it; "This has in it the presence, 'The Real Objective Presence,' of my glorified body."

And lastly, He said: "This is my body:" but these doctrines say, It is not his body, but it contains, has with it, or has under its form the presence of, Himself. He said: "This is my blood:" but these doctrines say, It is not his blood; but it contains, has with it, or has under its form the presence of, Himself.

So great are the differences between the really literal interpretation of our Lord's words in the institution of the Eucharist, and the glosses which the Roman, Lutheran, and Tractarian doctrines impose upon them, as "the most proper and plain, the grammatical, most simple, and natural signification:" and so far beyond and besides "that which the words exactly, and neither more nor less, convey," do these doctrines go. They are a contradiction to our Lord's act and words.

CHAPTER XII.

OUR LORD GAVE HIS BODY BROKEN, AND HIS BLOOD SHED. HE GAVE NOT NOR PROMISED HIS GLORIFIED BODY. NO PRESENCE OF THAT WHICH HE DID GIVE, AND NO PRESENCE OF THAT WHICH HE DID NOT PROMISE, TO BE EXPECTED.

HAVING determined the meaning and force of the words of our Lord Jesus Christ at the institution of the Eucharist, we are here to consider what their meaning and force are now. It has, indeed, been shown that the Sacrament is the very same, neither greater nor less, from its institution until now: that we have the same command, the same words with the same meaning, the same outward and visible signs, the same inward and spiritual grace: but it is necessary more particularly to develop and exhibit the bearing of this fact upon the doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence."

We have seen then, that by the literal interpretation of the words of our Lord Jesus Christ at the institution of this Sacrament, it was his dead body, and his blood poured out from it, which He gave to his disciples: but that the context, relating the circumstances and his acts, shows that they were not his body and blood in fact. We have seen that He gave that which was not: and that there was no presence of Himself, either living or dead, in the bread and wine which He called, and therefore made, his body and his blood. But since He gave that which was to be, his body broken, and his blood shed; He gave them in spiritual and life-giving power.

And now, as St. Paul teaches,* "Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more: death hath no more dominion over Him." And not only so, but He is now glorified, and He has entered into his glory which He had with the Father before the world was. It is therefore impossible that his body should be broken, that it should be in a state of sacrifice: impossible that his blood should be shed. Bishop Andrewes, therefore, said no more than the Divine word teaches, and true Catholic

* Rom. vi. 9.

antiquity also, taught by it, testifies, that "the body of our Lord is now impassible, and cannot be broken." No Christian, indeed, will imagine that it can.

But since it is his body broken which he now gives, and his blood poured out from it, He therefore gives that which is not : and since it has been ; since his body was broken and his blood was shed, He gives them now, not any more in fact than at the first, but equally in spiritual and life-giving power.

The bread taken, blessed, broken, and given, is his body in that power : and so also the wine taken, blessed, and given, is his blood : both, as much and as truly now, as when his living voice so called them.

Is this, then, by a "Real Objective Presence?" By a "Real Objective Presence" of his broken body and of his blood shed ; of his dead body, and of his blood poured out from it, this cannot be : because his body is no longer dead, but living ; his blood can no more be shed, because He is risen again, and is glorified for evermore. I do not know that anyone has ever imagined such an impossibility, unless in those impiously devised fables of Rome, of a bleeding child in the host. They, certainly, who interpret our Lord's words of his glorified body, would not admit that the "Real Objective Presence" of his body in the condition which the word "given" means, or of his blood in the condition which the word "shed" means, is possible. If this could have been even conceived to be possible, the "Real Presence" of his glorified body would not have been imagined.

But our Lord said nothing of his glorified body. He spoke of and gave his body broken and his blood shed ; and that in the very particular condition which the words "broken" and "shed" mean. Nor did he speak of any presence there of that which He gave. He gave not as the world giveth. He gave in spirit, not in the letter. He gave that which was not, but was to be : and now He gives that which is not, but has been. His body now is not, nor can be, broken ; but He gives it broken still, because it was broken : his blood now is not, nor can be, shed ; but He gives his outpoured blood still, because it was once shed. He gives not, nor spoke of, his glorified body ; but He spoke of and gave his dead body. So He does now ; so only He now speaks and gives. He spoke not of, nor gave, his body and blood in vital union together, but He spoke

of and gave them separated, one from the other, by death. And so only does He, now also, speak and give.

But the dead body of Christ is not: it is nowhere in the whole creation of God. It has been given, it has been broken: but now it is not, nor can be in that condition ever again. It is not; and that which is not, cannot have a "real objective presence." The glorified body has "a real objective presence" in heaven: but the dead body is not and cannot be in heaven or in earth by any real presence.

The sum of all, therefore, is, that, although the body of our Lord Jesus Christ is now glorified, and is for ever inseparably united with his Soul and Godhead; and although his body may, therefore, have, or be conceived to have, exemption "from the laws of nature," and to be invested with "new qualities" from "its oneness with Deity:" this is altogether beside the question; since our Lord neither spoke of, nor gave, his glorified body, and therefore does not give his glorified body now. If it were demonstrated with infallible certainty, and beyond the very possibility of doubt, that his body glorified could be in innumerable places on earth, and in millions of hosts or pieces of bread; and yet all the while be sitting on his throne with the Father in heaven: it would be but misspent labour, and could never prove, "The Real Objective Presence" of our Lord's glorified body in the Eucharist; and this for the unanswerable reason, that as He neither spoke of nor gave, his glorified body, He neither promised it nor gives it now.

There is no "Real and Objective Presence" in the Eucharist, of that which our Lord did not give and promise.

Neither again, is there, or can there be, a "Real Objective Presence" of that which He did give and promise. He gave and promised his flesh, his dead body. He gives it now: but yet it is not: and that which is not cannot have a "Real Objective Presence."

Very forcible and memorable are the words of Bishop Andrewes, as before cited: "Christ,—as and when He was 'offered up,'—'offered in sacrifice.' A live lamb is not it, it is a lamb slain must be our Passover.—Christ's body that now is. True; but not Christ's body as it now is, but as it then was, when it was offered, rent, and slain, and sacrificed for us. Not as now He is, glorified, for so He is not, so He cannot be *immolatus*, for He is immortal and impassible. But

as He then was when He suffered death, that is, passible and mortal.—We are—carried—back to Christ as He was at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering.—By the incomprehensible power of His Eternal Spirit, not He alone, but He as at the very act of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into His death, and invested in the benefits of it. IF AN HOST COULD BE TURNED INTO HIM NOW, GLORIFIED AS HE IS, IT WOULD NOT SERVE; CHRIST OFFERED IS IT, thither we must look. To the Serpent lift up, thither we must repair, even *ad cadaver*; we must *hoc facere*, do that is then done. So, and no otherwise, is this *epulare* to be conceived.”*

The teaching of this Mentor in our Israel is in clear and full accordance with the preceding conclusions. It would have been well if it had been better understood in the appeals which have been made to his authority. His wisdom would have precluded the teaching of a presence which has not been promised, as well as of a presence known to be impossible. “If an host could be turned into Him now, glorified as He is, it would not serve; Christ offered is it. We must repair, even *ad cadaver*.”

Metaphysical disquisitions about presence and absence are here of no use. They only deceive the disputer himself, and abuse his reader. The presence meant in the doctrines of “The Real Presence,” is a presence down here upon earth, and comprised within the limits of the elements in the Eucharist; a presence subject to these elements, so as to be moved in and with them, taken and eaten in and with them. And the very words which express this are an irrefragable proof against the doctrine of “The Real Objective Presence:” for that body of which these words are spoken, cannot be broken, since it is glorified.

There is, then, no real presence of the glorified body of Christ in the Eucharist, for the one sufficient reason that He neither gave, nor promised to give, his glorified body. And there is no real presence of his dead body in the Eucharist, for the one sufficient reason that his dead body now is not, and therefore cannot be present. That which is not, cannot have a real presence.

* Sermon on the Resurrection, 1 Cor. v. 7, 8. Works, Lib. Ang. Cath. Theol. ii. 291, 296, 301, 302.

Thus it is clearly and irrefragably deduced from the strictly literal interpretation of our Lord's words in conjunction with the circumstances in which He spoke them, that there is no real presence of his body and blood, or of his body glorified or given, in the Eucharist, or in the elements of the Eucharist, or with them, or under their species or form.

CHAPTER XIII.

ST. JOHN VI. AND 1 COR. XI.

THE sixth chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, so much relied upon by the teachers of the "Real Objective Presence" of our Lord's body in the Eucharist, will be found no more favourable to their doctrine than the words and facts of the institution of this Sacrament, in their literal construction, have been proved to be.

Our Lord's discourse in this chapter has been the subject of much controversy: but, I think, to little purpose. In the opinion of some, it refers to the Eucharist: in the opinion of others, it does not refer to it. But all, no doubt, would agree that it refers to that which is the grace of this Sacrament, whether exclusively belonging to the Sacrament, or conveyed by it, or not.

To those, indeed, who consider that, when our Lord took the bread, and said "Take, eat; this is my body which is given for you;" and when He took the cup and said, "Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood:" He appointed and declared the way in which that, which, in this discourse, He said was so necessary to be done; there will be a manifest connection between the discourse and the Sacrament. And they will be confirmed and justified in this by a like connection between a former passage in this Gospel, and the other Sacrament.

What the connection in the present case is, is now to be considered. And for this purpose, I think it quite unnecessary to take into consideration the discussions which have been raised about divisions or change of subjects in this discourse, and the verse in which such change may be fixed.

The passage to which the reader's attention is here to be directed, is as follows, beginning at the fifty-first verse: "I am the living bread, which came down from heaven: if a man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread

that I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Jesus, therefore said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat in truth, and my blood is drink in truth. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is the bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat the manna, and are dead; he that eateth this bread shall live for ever. These things said He in a synagogue, as He taught in Capernaum. Many, therefore, of his disciples, when they had heard this, said: This is an hard saying; who can hear it? But Jesus, knowing in Himself, that his disciples murmured concerning it, said unto them: Doth this offend you? What, then, if ye should see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before! The Spirit is that which quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words, that I speak unto you, are spirit and are life."

Our Lord, then, declares, that He is "the living bread," and that "if a man eat of this bread he shall live for ever:" but that the living bread is to die, in order that it may have that life-giving power: "for the bread," He says, "that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." He was to die that the world might live. He declares the universal efficacy of his flesh, that every one of the children of men who should eat it, should "live for ever." And next He declares the necessity to certain of the children of men that they should both eat his flesh and drink his blood. For when the Jews asked among themselves: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" He said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." It is observable that He does not say, as He is commonly taken to say, "Except a man eat and drink," but "Except ye eat and drink:" that is, as now to be applied, "Except they to whom the Gospel is preached, eat his flesh, and drink his blood, they have no life in them." He does not say that no man can be saved, who shall not eat his flesh and drink his blood: and thus He distinguishes

between the universal efficacy and the universal necessity, of doing this.

And in order that we may eat his flesh, He first gives it for the life of the world. He gave his life, gave it to God, gave it that the world might live; gave it an offering, to take away the sin of the world. And of Him thus given to God, He says we are to eat the "flesh and drink the blood;" for which purpose the body and the blood are necessarily to be separate from each other: and therefore it is the flesh of his dead body. To drink his blood it must be separate from his body, and so the blood being the life, and poured forth for sin, the body is dead. Four times in so many verses, one after the other, He speaks of eating his flesh and drinking his blood; setting forth how necessary it was for those who heard Him to do this, and what great benefit should follow. And He represents his dead body, his body and his blood, as the living bread. But he says not a word of eating his living body or his glorified body.

And when the people thought that He spoke of tearing his flesh with their teeth, and eating it as they would eat the flesh of their sacrifices, He corrects their mistake, telling them that He was to ascend up where He was before, so that such eating would be impossible. But still, leaving the necessity always remaining, that they should eat his flesh and drink his blood, He teaches them that this is to be done spiritually, and not literally and carnally; and that such eating of his flesh as they imagined, would profit them nothing. "The Spirit is that which quickeneth," which giveth life, and maketh a man to live for ever. "The words that I speak unto you" are not to be taken as ye have carnally taken them, for they "are spirit," and to those who will take them as spirit, they "are life."

Thus our Lord Jesus Christ spoke of his flesh yet to be eaten, and of his blood yet to be drunk, when He was gone up into heaven: but He said not a word of his body when glorified in heaven, and invested with new power, being ever present on earth so that they might be partakers of it. He spoke plainly of absence, and not of presence. And He spoke of his dead body, and of his poured-out blood, to be taken when his body should be no longer dead, and his blood should be no longer poured out, and neither his body nor his blood could ever be again in the condition which the words "given" and "shed" mean.

But a "Real Objective Presence" of his glorified body, if it were proved to be ever so possible, in heaven and in many

places on earth, would not "serve," as Bishop Andrewes says, for this. It is the dead body, his body as a sacrifice and not in glory, of which our Lord speaks. And as He speaks not of, nor promises, the glorified body, and it therefore is not present; the presence, "The Real Objective Presence," of his dead body and of his outpoured blood is impossible, because they are not. That, which is not, cannot be really present in, or with, or under any elements, or under their species. It cannot be really present anywhere.

One other place only of Holy Scripture is to be examined here. St. Paul thus writes, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not considering the Lord's body." *

The apostle had just before related the institution of the Sacrament, as he had "received it of the Lord" Himself, and as it is related in the Gospels: and he had thus taught the Corinthians, that the bread is the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for us, and that the cup is his blood which was shed for us; and so that it is the given body and the blood outpoured from it, and therefore the dead body. "For as often," he says, "as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." And in perfect consistency with this, he continues in the passage before us to speak of the body and blood of the Lord, and of the dishonour and outrage done to his body by him who receives them unworthily.

Here, therefore, again, so far from any reference to the glory of Christ, or to his body as it now is, glorified, it is his death as shown by the eating of the bread and drinking of the wine; it is his body and blood, which is spoken of: it is not his body only, but his body and blood, the body given, the blood shed; and therefore his dead body.

And "this bread and this cup of the Lord" are in such a way, and so certainly, his dead body, and his poured-out blood, that he who "shall eat and drink unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." "Guilty," he would necessarily and certainly have said, "of the glorious body" of the Lord, of offence and dishonour to it, if "The Real Objective Presence" of it had been thought of. But, on the contrary, he

* 1 Cor. xi. 27-29.

says "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," because by eating the bread and drinking the cup unworthily, he discerns not the Lord's body, but takes it as a common or "unholy thing."

What the true meaning and full force of the expression, "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," may be, seems, perhaps, doubtful; but it clearly signifies a guilt connected with the Lord's death, whether of causing it, or of unbelief and disregard of it: which, indeed, would both amount to the same. He discerns not the Lord's body slain for him; treats it with carnal indifference; and continues in sin for which Christ died. Thus he is "guilty" of the death, "of the body and blood of the Lord."

So, again, in this place of Holy Scripture, no proof or authority is to be found for the doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence" of the glorified body of Christ in, or with, or under the bread and wine of the Eucharist, or their forms or species.

But now comes the question, How did the ancient Fathers understand these places of Scripture, the literal interpretation of which has been thus investigated? and especially, how did they understand them, who were taught by the apostles and by those who had "compared with" them, and were therefore possessed of advantages for a right understanding of them, which later authorities did not enjoy? This question most certainly demands an answer; and it shall therefore be the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE TEACHING OF THE ANCIENT FATHERS.

It is well known that the teachers of "The Real Presence," profess that their doctrine is identical with the doctrine of the ancient Fathers; and that they appeal with confidence to the writings of these venerable authorities. I readily and heartily join in an appeal to them, knowing that their testimony is valid, and that it will, on consideration, be found to confirm the interpretation I have given of those passages relating to the Eucharist, which have been the subject of the previous investigation.

But in order to prosecute this appeal, the question at issue must first be clearly stated. And the question is, as proposed at the end of the preceding chapter,—Did the ancient Fathers understand the places of Holy Scripture, which we have been examining, in the sense, that it is the body given for us, the dead body, and the blood poured out from it, which our Lord gave and now gives in the Eucharist; or did they understand Him, and the apostle, to mean, that He is really present in his glorified body in, with, or under the bread and wine, or under their forms; and that it is this glorified body thus present, of which we partake in this Sacrament? Or in other form, Did the ancient Fathers understand the words: "This is," in the expressions, "This is my body, which is given for you,—This is my blood which is shed for you," as meaning, with the Romanist, "This contains"; or with the Lutheran, "this has with it"; or with the Tractarian, "This has under its form the presence of"? Or let the reader write down our Lord's words: "This is my body, which is given for you, This is my blood which is shed for you:" and, placing them side by side with the testimonies of the Fathers, consider whether they regarded any of these three propositions following as identical with the propositions expressed in our Lord's words: namely, the Roman, "This thing contains or has in it, my glorified body and blood"; the Lutheran, "This has with it my glorified body and blood"; or the Tractarian, "This

has in it, or under its form, the presence of my glorified body." For these are the propositions to which the several doctrines are respectively to be reduced, in order to make them, as they are intended to be, literal interpretations of our Lord's words in the institution of the Eucharist.

We proceed then, with the "evidence" which is proposed to prove "that the belief in the Real Presence was part of the faith of Christians from the first," as that evidence is supplied in English by Dr. Pusey. I select the work of this learned and most industrious Divine, because I take it for granted, that he has not overlooked any place of any Father which seemed to his purpose. And for necessary brevity, I shall cite only so much as is material to the present question: omitting a multiplication of passages to the same purpose from the same writer, and the many and long extracts which are not pertinent to the question.

1. ST. IGNATIUS.

"The Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His mercy raised again.—Haste ye to partake of One Eucharist. For there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup for the uniting of His Blood, one Altar."

2. ST. JUSTIN MARTYR.

"We have been taught that the Food, over which thanksgiving has been made by the prayer of the word which is from Him,—is the Flesh and Blood of Him, the Incarnate Jesus."

3. ST. IRENÆUS.

"That bread, over which thanks are given, is the body of their Lord, and the Cup is the Cup of His blood.—Taking bread, of this our creation, He confessed that it was His own body, and He affirmed that the mingled drink of the Cup was His own blood.—The slaves had heard from their masters, that the Divine Communion is the Body and Blood of Christ."

4. TATIAN.

"Having taken bread, and afterwards the cup of wine, He bare witness that it was His Body and Blood, and bade them eat and drink, for that it was a memorial of His coming Suffering and Death."

5. ST. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

"Eat ye, He saith, My Flesh, and drink My Blood. This Food from Himself the Lord provideth for us, and offereth Flesh and poureth out Blood.—He bids us put off from us the old corruption of the flesh, as also

the old food, and partaking of another new nourishment, that of Christ, receiving Him as far as possible, to lay Him up in ourselves and place the Saviour in our breast.—Not little is that Lamb of God Who taketh away the sins of the world, Who was led as a lamb to the slaughter; that Sacrifice full of marrow,—so well nourished and exceedingly enlarged, as to suffice for all things, and be distributed, and fill those who eat Him, and are satiated with Him; Who is both Bread and Flesh, and giveth Himself, being both, to us to eat. To the sons, then, who approach, the Father giveth the Calf and slayeth It, and It is eaten.—I am thy Nourisher, Who give thee Myself as Bread, of Which whoso tasteth, no more tasteth death, and Who daily give thee the drink of immortality.”

6. TERTULLIAN.

“The Jews laid violent hands but once upon Christ; these [makers of idols, chosen into the ministry of the Church] every day assault His body.—What hands ought more to be cut off than those by which the Body of the Lord is offended?—Christ is our Bread, because Christ is life, and bread is life.—Then again, because *in* the Bread is understood His Body: ‘This is my Body.’—Most think that—when the Body of the Lord has been received, the station must be broken up. Doth, then, the Eucharist break up a service devoted to God?—When the Body of the Lord hath been received and reserved, both are saved, both the partaking of the sacrifice and the fulfilment of the service.—The flesh feeds on the Body and Blood of Christ, that the soul, too, may be fattened from God.—He [the Heathen convert] is fed with the fatness of the Lord’s Body, even the Eucharist.—He made the bread which He took and distributed to His disciples that His own Body, saying, ‘This is my body,’ i.e. the figure of my Body. But it would not be a figure, unless His Body were a true Body.”

7. “The ancient *Author* of the *Carmina adversus Marcionem*.”

“He—said of the bread received, and juice of the vine also, ‘This is My Body and My Blood, which is shed for you,’ which He bade ever after to be done.”

8. HIPPOLYTUS.

“‘And she prepared her Table;’ the knowledge of the Holy Trinity promised, and His precious and pure Body and Blood, which daily at the mystical and Divine Table are consecrated, being sacrificed in remembrance of that ever-to-be-remembered and first Table of the Divine and Mystical Supper.—He gave us His Divine Flesh and His precious Blood to eat and to drink for the remission of sins.”

9. ORIGEN.

“Ye who are wont to be present at the Divine mysteries, know how, when ye receive the Body of the Lord, ye keep it with all care and

reverence.—He who is imbued with the mysteries knoweth the Flesh and Blood of the Word of God.—Fearest thou not, approaching the Eucharist to communicate of the Body of Christ, as though clean and pure, and there were nothing in thee unworthy!—They have been together frequently at the same Table of the Body of Christ and at the same draught of His blood.”

10. ST. FIRMIAN.

“They, in communion rashly granted, touch the Body and Blood of the Lord.”

11. ST. DIONYSIUS ALEXANDRINUS.

“One, who,—for a long while had partaken of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.—To approach the Holy Table, or to touch the Body and Blood of Christ.—His giving Himself to us in the Mystical Supper, is thus called by God Himself, the New Testament.”

12. ST. CYPRIAN.

“We fortify them with the protection of the Body and Blood of Christ; and since the Eucharist was ordained for this, that It may be a safeguard for them that receive It, those whom we would have safe against the adversary, we must arm with the defence of the fulness of the Lord. For how do we teach or provoke them to shed their blood in confession of the Name, if, when about to engage, we deny them the blood of Christ?—Let us also arm the right hand with the ‘sword of the Spirit,’ that we may boldly reject the deadly sacrifices, and [that] mindful of the Eucharist, the hand which has received the Lord’s body, may embrace the Lord Himself.—The fallen threatens the upright, the wounded the sound; and is imperiously wrathful against the Priests, because he is not permitted at once to take the Lord’s Body in his defiled hands, and drink the Lord’s blood with his polluted mouth.”

13. ST. LAWRENCE THE MARTYR.

“To whom hast thou committed the consecrated Blood of Christ?”

14. MAGNES.

“It is not a type of the Body, nor a type of the Blood,—but is in truth the Body and Blood of Christ.—Through that union whereby I am united, the Holy with the earthly, I give bread and wine, commanding them to be My Body and Blood.—Christ gave to believers His own Body and Blood, infusing into them the life-giving medicine of Divinity.—That Body which is that mystical Bread, and the Blood, which is that Wine, give from themselves to him who partaketh, the Immortality of the undefiled Divinity.”

15. ST. PETER OF ALEXANDRIA.

“The participation of the Body and Blood.”

16. EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA.

“You may see those who partake of the holy Food and the Saviour’s Body receive It, and after eating, worship Him who giveth and provideth the Life-giving Food.—We who are upon earth partake of the Bread which came down from Heaven, and the Word which emptied Itself and made itself small. But they who are in the Kingdom of Heaven partake of it Full and Perfect, nourished by its Divinity.”

17. THE COUNCIL OF NICE.

“Neither the Canon nor usage has handed down, that those who have no power to offer, should give to them who offer, the Body of Christ.”

18. ST. JAMES OF NISIBIS.

“Abstain then from all uncleanness, and then receive the Body and Blood of Christ, and carefully guard thy mouth through which the King hath entered.—He kept the Passover, and gave His Body that they should eat, and His Blood that they should drink.—When then His Body was eaten, and His Blood drunk, He was ‘counted among the dead.’ For our Lord with His own Hands gave His Body for Food, and when He was not yet crucified, He gave His Blood for drink.—Our Lord brought forth for us His own Flesh for food.”

19. ST. ATHANASIUS THE GREAT.

“When the great and wonderful prayers have been completed over it, then the bread becometh the Body, the Cup the Blood, of our Lord Jesus Christ.”*

I have reproduced in the above series, faithful abstracts of the passages from the works of these Fathers, which Dr. Pusey has cited, at, as it appears to me, very unnecessary length.† These abstracts reach to the early part of the fourth century, embracing the Council of Nice and the testimony of that great Father, Athanasius. Beyond this period, I do not think it necessary to drag the reader page by page through the remaining three or four hundred pages of Dr. Pusey’s work: and shall notice the evidence cited by him from those Fathers only who may be regarded as of chief authority in the Church.

* This is given in Note Q., vii. viii., p. 238 of Doctor Pusey’s work.

† I have also avoided the unnecessary multiplication of passages, which could add nothing to the meaning of those I have noticed.

20. COUNCIL OF ALEXANDRIA, A.D. 339.

“To you only it appertains to have the first taste of the Blood of Christ.”

21. ST. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM.

“The bread and wine of the Eucharist before the holy invocation of the Adorable Trinity was *simple* (λίτος) bread and wine, while after the invocation the Bread becomes the Body of Christ, and the Wine the Blood of Christ. As the Bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is *mere* (λίτος) bread no longer, but the Body of Christ; so also this holy ointment is no more simple [ψιλόν] ointment, nor (so to say) common [κοινόν] after the invocation, but the gift of Christ; and by the presence of His Godhead, it causes in us the Holy Ghost.—Since He Himself has declared and said of the Bread, ‘This is My Body,’ who shall dare to doubt any longer? And since He has affirmed and said, ‘This is My Blood,’ who shall ever hesitate, saying, That it is not His blood?—With fullest assurance let us partake as of the Body and Blood of Christ: for *in* the figure of Bread is given to thee His Body, and *in* the figure of Wine His Blood, that thou by partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, mightest be made of the same body and the same blood with Him.—Contemplate the Bread and Wine not *as bare* (ώς ψιλῶς) elements; for they are, according to the Lord’s declaration, the Body and Blood of Christ; for, though sense suggest this to thee, let faith stablish thee.—We call upon the merciful God to send forth His Holy Spirit upon the gifts lying before Him, that He may make the Bread the Body of Christ, and the Wine the Blood of Christ; for whatsoever the Holy Ghost has touched is sanctified and changed.—We are bidden to taste, not bread and wine, but the *antitype* of the Body and Blood of Christ.”

22. ST. BASIL THE GREAT.

“We are entrusted with the Body and Blood of Christ.”

23. ST. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUM.

“Those who are to be over the people, and to handle the mighty Body of Christ.—With bloodless cutting you divide the Body and Blood of the Lord.”

24. ST. MACARIUS OF EGYPT.

“The Lord embodieth Himself even into meat and drink, (as it is written in the Gospel: ‘he that eateth this Bread shall live for ever,’) that He may ineffably rest the soul, and fill it with spiritual joy; for He saith, ‘I am the Bread of life.’”

25. ST. AMBROSE.

“He must be free from the allurements of various pleasures,—that He may administer the Body and Blood of Christ.—In that Sacrament Christ is: because it is the Body of Christ.—It [the measure of wine] is

understood more fully of the Blood of Christ.—How in such hands wilt thou receive the all-holy Body of the Lord? how wilt thou bear to thy mouth the precious Blood?”

26. ST. JEROME.

“The Bread which the Lord brake and gave to His disciples was the Body of the Lord our Saviour, since He Himself said to them, ‘Take, eat, This is My Body;’ and the Cup was That of which He said again, ‘Drink ye all of this; for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many.’—With holy mouth they make Christ’s Body.—Nought richer than he who carries the Body of the Lord in a wicker basket, His Blood in a glass.—Those at whose prayers the Body and Blood of Christ is made.”

27. ST. AUGUSTINE.

“After a certain manner, the Sacrament of the Body of Christ, is the Body of Christ, the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ, the Blood of Christ.—There the rock was Christ; to us That is Christ which is placed on the Altar of God.—How, ‘carried in His Own Hands?’ Because, when He commended His Own Body and Blood, He took into His Hands That which the faithful know; and in a manner carried Himself, when He said, ‘This is my Body.’—That Bread which ye see on the Altar, sanctified by the Word of God, is the Body of Christ. That Cup, rather what the Cup holds, sanctified by the Word of God, is the Blood of Christ.”

28. ST. CHRYSOSTOM.

“Thou seest the Lord sacrificed and lying, and the Priest standing and praying over the Sacrifice, and all [the people] reddened with that Precious Blood.—Christ is present now too. The same Who adorned that Table, adorneth this too now. For it is not man who maketh what lieth there to become the Body and Blood of Christ, but Christ Himself who was crucified for us. The Priest standeth, filling up a figure, speaking these words; the power and the grace are of God. ‘This is My Body,’ He saith. This word re-ordereth what lieth there, and as that Voice, ‘increase and multiply,’ was spoken once, but throughout all time in effect giveth power to our race to the procreation of children, so also that Voice once spoken doth on every Table in the Churches from that time even till now and unto His Coming, complete the Sacrifice.”

29. THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS.

“Let each order by itself partake of the Lord’s Body and the Precious Blood, in order, with reverence and godly fear, as though approaching to the Body of the King.”

30. ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA.

“We receive Him in ourselves through His Holy Body and Blood.—He who has been made partaker of Christ, through partaking of His Holy Flesh and Blood, ought also to have His mind, and follow His inward acts.—Doubt not that this is true, since He clearly saith, ‘This is My Body and

This is my blood ; ' but rather receive in faith the Word of the Saviour ; for being Truth, He doth not lie.—We know it to be the Body of no other, but of Him which is by nature life, having in itself the whole virtue of the united Word, and inqualified (*πεποιωμένον*) yea, or rather, filled with His effectuating might, through which all things are quickened, and retained in being.—We celebrate the holy, and life-giving and unbloody Sacrifice in the Churches, not believing the Offering to be the Body of one of us, and of a common Man : likewise also the precious Blood ; receiving them rather as being His own Body and also Blood of the Word who quickeneth all things."

31. ST. LEO THE GREAT.

"They [the Manichees] so compromise with themselves in the Communion of the Sacrament, as sometimes, lest they should not be able entirely to escape notice, to receive with unworthy mouth the Body of Christ, but the Blood of our Redemption they altogether refuse to drink."

Such is the nature of the evidence produced by Dr. Pusey from the ancient Fathers for his doctrine of "The Real Presence." It is, indeed, the evidence on which all the other advocates of that doctrine confidently rely, whether they be Roman, Lutheran, or Tractarian. I have recited it with perfect impartiality : omitting only, (1) an unnecessary multiplication of passages from the same Father up to the time of St. Athanasius ; (2) so much of the context as it was needless for me to reproduce ; (3) passages of the same purport as the others from Fathers of minor importance ; and (4) passages which do not speak of or refer specifically to the Eucharist, but relate to spiritual communion, with or without the Sacrament. I have omitted all notice of the last kind because it does not appear at all certain, that when any of these venerable authorities speak of the Body and Blood of Christ, they must be understood of the Eucharist ; although it might appear, as it would, that they believed the bread to be the body of Christ, and the wine to be the blood of Christ. This from Hilary, for example : " ' Give us this day our daily bread,' for what doth God so will, as that Christ should daily dwell in us, Who is the Bread of life, and the Bread from Heaven ? And because it is a daily prayer, daily also it is prayed, that that Bread be given : " is nothing whatever to the purpose of proving "The Real Presence." It says nothing of any presence, nor is there anything in it to show that it applies to the Eucharist at all. And this part of Dr. Pusey's work is largely made up, I think, of passages, as little pertinent to the purpose. In fact, I find that fully one half in number, and much more in bulk, of the passages he has

cited to prove "that the belief in the Real Presence was part of the faith of Christians from the first," are quite inapplicable; and consequently that the number of the Fathers he has called in evidence must be considerably reduced.

And now, what does the proper evidence from the ancient Fathers prove? It simply, and most certainly proves this, that they believed that after consecration the bread is the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the wine is his blood. This also Dr. Pusey says of them: "The Fathers," he asserts, "not only say that the bread *becomes* the Body of Christ, but that it *is* the Body of Christ:" and again; "the Church believed of old that the consecrated element remained in its natural substance, wine," and "the Sacrament to be 'the Blood of Christ.'"*

But the propositions that the bread is the body of Christ, and that the wine is the blood of Christ, are quite distinct from the propositions which assert that the bread or its species contains the body of Christ, and that the wine or its species contains the blood of Christ: that the bread has the body of Christ with it, and that the wine has the blood of Christ joined with it: that the bread or its form has in it or under it the presence of the body of Christ, and that the wine or its form has in it or under it the presence of the blood of Christ. And the distinction of these propositions from those which express the logical conclusion from the evidence of the ancient Fathers, is so great as to make all the difference between false doctrine and true; between denial of our Lord's words, and the acknowledgment of their truth. For a denial of our Lord's words, "This is my body which is given for you, This is my blood which is shed for you," underlies the doctrines which make the bread and the wine not to be themselves the body and blood of Christ, but to contain them, or to have their presence in or with them.

These glosses asserting "The Real Presence," whether in the Roman, the Lutheran, or the Tractarian form, have no sanction whatever in the writings of the ancient Fathers, or in the doctrine of the primitive Church. Very observable, indeed, is the fact, on the contrary, that for many hundred years from the first institution, they teach with one voice, that the bread in the Eucharist is the body of Christ, and that the wine is his blood. They had no thought that the bread was not his body nor the wine his blood. They had no thought that our Lord's body and

* Doctrine of the Real Presence, pp. 257, 474.

blood were contained in the elements, or were present with or in them, or their form.

There are, indeed, a few places in which Dr. Pusey imagines that he has found special proofs of his doctrine: so at least, one may conjecture from the italics with which he emphasises them. I am therefore bound to examine these places, and see whether any proof of the doctrine of "The Real Presence" is to be found in them.

To take them, then, in chronological order, we begin with TERTULLIAN, who is thus cited by Dr. Pusey in his sermon "on the Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist:" "In the bread is understood His body."* And in Note I,† referring to this page, he briefly mentions it as one of the passages in which the use of the word *in*, "*does* imply the existence of the elements *in* which the Body and Blood of our Lord are said to be:" i.e. one of the passages which say that the Body and Blood are *in* the elements, the existence of which elements, therefore, is implied. And by the Body and Blood of our Lord being *in* the elements, is meant, be it remembered, "The Real Objective Presence" of our Lord's glorified body in the bread and wine. But the whole passage is given in Note S,‡ and is as follows:—

"We may rather understand spiritually, 'GIVE US THIS DAY OUR DAILY BREAD.' For Christ is our Bread, because Christ is life, and bread is life. 'I am,' saith He, 'the bread of life,' and a little above, 'The Bread is the Word of the living God, which cometh down from Heaven.' Then again, because *in* the Bread is understood His Body: 'This is my Body.' Wherefore, in praying for 'daily bread,' we pray to be perpetually in Christ, and undivided from His body."⁷²

Now in order to make this a proof of "The Real Presence," it must be shown that by "the bread," Tertullian meant the bread in the Eucharist; next, that by "His body" he meant our Lord's glorified body, for "The Real Presence" is of the glorified body; and lastly, that by "is understood" he meant "is,"—that by "censetur" he meant "est." But there is nothing to show that by "the bread" is meant the bread of the Eucharist, though it may be meant; while it may also be meant of the "daily bread" for which we ask in the Lord's Prayer, or the "bread of life." Then that by "His body" Tertullian meant our Lord's glorified body, cannot be maintained for a moment.

* P. 40.

† P. 132.

‡ P. 332.

⁷² "Corpus ejus in pane censetur: Hoc est corpus meum." The translation in Clarke's Ante-Nicene Christian Library, gives this place incorrectly: "His body is reckoned [to be] in bread."

Tertullian believed that the bread of the Eucharist is our Lord's body which was given for us, and that the wine is his blood which was shed for us. He would have been an exception to all other Christian writers of his time and before him, if he had not so believed. And until these two propositions, "This is my body, This is my blood," be proved to be identical, and to mean the same thing, in the belief of Tertullian, we must conclude that he had no thought of the presence of our Lord's glorified body being "*in* the bread." Nor can it be pretended that "is understood" is equivalent to "is." This place, therefore, of Tertullian does not prove "The Real Presence" of our Lord's glorified body "*in* the bread." It does not say that his glorified body is in the bread, nor yet that his body which was given for us is in the bread, but that his body is understood in it, which is quite a different thing from saying that his body is in it, or is understood to be in it.

But here let it be remarked once for all, with regard to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, that when they teach that the bread of the Eucharist is the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the wine is his blood, they did not use or understand these propositions as identical, or meaning, or amounting to, the same thing; which is necessarily and in reality the case with all who hold the doctrine of "The Real Presence." For since it is "The Real Presence" of our Lord's glorified body which they mean; and it is a negation of his glorified body to speak of its blood being shed: when they talk of "The Real Presence," they must mean "The Real Presence" of our Lord's glorified body not only under the bread or its form, but also under the wine or its form: because the blood of the glorified body is not, nor can be, or be conceived to be, shed, or separated from it. It is either the body with the blood, or the blood with the body, the body containing, the blood contained; both in living vital union: and it is the self-same thing, only differently expressed or viewed. The necessary result is, that the two propositions contained in the words of the institution, are dealt with by the teachers of "The Real Presence," as identical, as meaning and amounting to the same thing. The whole doctrine is, in fact, built upon the four words, "*Hoc est corpus meum, this is my body:*" and the other proposition, "This is my blood," is dealt with, either as identical in meaning, or as having no meaning at all, and in either case superfluous. Witness, as I have said before, the various works on this doctrine, and especially Arch-

deacon Wilberforce's book, from which these words, wherever they appear in it, may be blotted out, without any influence or effect upon the argument.

But the ancient Fathers held no such unscriptural, self-contradictory doctrine. They held that the bread of the Eucharist is the body of Christ, not that it or its form contains the body of Christ; and that the wine is the blood of Christ, not that it or its form contains the blood of Christ. And as they held that these two propositions "This is my body, This is my blood," did not mean the same thing; that the body and blood were as distinct from each other in the Sacrament as the bread and wine are distinct from each other: they neither did nor could believe that invention of a far later age, that in the bread or under its form, and in the wine or its form, is contained whole Christ: or that our Lord's glorified body is in or under each. This is the doctrine of "The Real Presence," or what it comes to: and this the ancient Fathers never held. They understood our Lord's words in the sense which He intended, and which only faith can accept. Since He said of the bread, "This is my body," they believed that the bread is his body; but with his own explanation, "which is given for you;" and therefore that the bread is his body as a sacrifice, his dead body: and since He said of the wine, "This is my blood," they believed that the wine is his blood; but again with his own explanation, "which is shed for you:" and therefore that the wine is his blood, separated from his body, thus leaving it bereft of life. They never thought that they received the blood of Christ in his body, or the body in his blood: nor, it must be repeated again and again, did they understand our Lord's words as asserting that his living body was contained in the bread or under its form, or that, in direct contradiction to the notion of the living body, his blood was contained in the wine or under its form. They accepted and believed the simple categorical statements, "This is my body which is being given for you, This is my blood which is being shed for you."

Next to Tertullian, we come to ST. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, from whose Catechetical Lectures, Dr. Pusey cites this passage:—

"*In the figure of Bread is given to thee His Body, and in the figure of Wine His blood.*"

But Cyril more correctly intimates his meaning than Dr. Pusey understands it: for he says:—

“ Since He Himself has declared and said of the Bread, *This is my Body*, who shall dare to doubt any longer? And since He has affirmed and said, *This is my Blood*, who shall ever hesitate, saying, that it is not His Blood?—Therefore with fullest assurance let us partake as of the Body and Blood of Christ. For in the figure [or type] of bread is given to Thee his Body, and in the figure [or type] of Wine His blood.”

And again :—

“ Contemplate therefore the Bread and Wine not as bare elements, for they are, according to the Lord’s declaration, the Body and Blood of Christ.” *

This ancient Father, then, held that the bread of the Eucharist is the body of Christ, and that the wine is his blood: which is quite a different thing from holding that his body is in, or is contained in, the bread, and that his blood is in, or is contained in, the wine. It is therefore by no means to be taken for granted that the word *ἐν*, in, is a preposition of place here. Neither the Greek *ἐν*, nor the Latin, “in,” is always a preposition of place: it is often in connection with the cause or manner of a thing. And in this place from St. Cyril, I submit that it is to be taken for “by,” more properly than for “in,” if we are to interpret him in consistency with himself: and in quite as much accordance with grammatical use. I shall therefore, instead of Dr. Pusey’s and Mr. Church’s⁷³ translation, cite the words thus;—as having better warrant: “By the type of bread is given to thee the body of Christ, and by the type of wine his blood.”

Moreover, it is to be observed, that the expressions “in the figure of bread, and in the figure of wine,” are not synonymous or identical in meaning with “in the bread and in the wine.” And yet again, St. Cyril, in these passages, and particularly in that on which Dr. Pusey relies for proof of his doctrine, speaks of the body and blood of our Lord, as distinctly from each other as the bread and wine. It was, therefore, not the living glorified body of which Cyril spoke, but of the body and

* Lect. xxii. 1, 3, 6.

⁷³ The translator of the Catechetical Lectures in the Library of the Fathers, Oxford, 1838, 271, Mr. Church, in his note on *ἐν τύπῳ*, says that “the word *τύπος* sometimes means that which stands for a thing present, sometimes that which stands for a thing absent.” But I find no proof offered that it “stands for a thing present.” Nor do I find in Dr. Pusey’s note I any such proof, except upon the assumption of “The Real Presence.” Overlooking, as he constantly does, the difference which I have so often asserted, and which is so obvious, between “is,” and “contains,” and unconsciously converting the acknowledgments of the ancient Fathers, that the bread is the body of Christ, and the wine his blood, into the very different doctrine that our Lord’s body is present under the form of these elements; he always takes it for granted that when the body and blood of our Lord are spoken of, it is the Eucharist which is intended, as having our glorified Lord present in the bread and wine, present under their forms: and then, of course, the bread and wine are “types, antitypes, figures, symbols, images,” of “a thing present.” But this is only to beg the question.

blood mutually separate, and therefore of the dead body. So far is he from giving sanction to the doctrine of "The Real Presence" of our Lord's glorified body *in* the figure of bread, or under its form.

We come now to ST. EPHREM SYRUS, of whom Dr. Pusey says, that he "often speaks of our Lord's Presence, under the image of fire *in* the bread." And the places from this writer are thus briefly cited in the Sermon:—

"*In* Thy visible vesture there dwelleth a hidden power." "*In* Thy Bread is hidden the Spirit that cannot be eaten. *In* Thy Wine there dwelleth the Fire that cannot be drunk. Instead of that fire which devoured men, ye eat the fire *in* the Bread and are quickened." "*In* the Bread and the Cup are fire and the Holy Ghost." "We have eaten Thee, we have drunken Thee, not that we shall make Thee fail, but that we may have life in Thee. Thy garment covered Thy feebler nature · the bread covereth the fire which dwells therein."

But these places are given at length in Note K: and we must take them with a somewhat larger reference than even we have them given there. In allusion to the healing of the woman who touched our Lord's garments, Ephrem says:—

"Thy garment, Lord, is a fountain of medicines. *In* Thy visible vesture there dwelleth an hidden power. A little spittle from Thy mouth became also a great miracle of light in the midst of its clay. *In* Thy Bread is hidden the Spirit that cannot be eaten; *in* Thy Wine there dwelleth the Fire that cannot be drunk. The [Dr. Pusey, 'Thy'] Spirit *in* Thy bread, and the Fire *in* Thy Cup are distinct miracles, which our lips receive. When the Lord came down to the earth unto mortal men, He created them a new Creation, as in the Angels He mingled Fire and the Spirit, that they might be of Fire and Spirit in a hidden manner. The Seraph did not bring the living coal near with his fingers; it did but come close up to Isaiah's mouth; he did not himself lay hold of it or eat it; but unto us the Lord hath given both of them. To the Angels which are spiritual Abraham brought bodily food, and they ate. A new miracle it is, that our mighty Lord giveth to bodily creatures Fire and the Spirit, as food and drink. Fire came down upon sinners in wrath, and consumed them. The Fire of the merciful in bread cometh down and abideth. Instead of that fire which devoured men, ye eat a Fire in bread and are quickened. As fire came down on the sacrifice of Elijah and consumed it, the Fire of Mercy hath become to us a Living Sacrifice. Fire ate up the oblations, and we, O Lord, have eaten Thy Fire in Thy oblation. Who hath ever taken hold of the Spirit in his fists? Come, and see, O Solomon, what the Lord of thy father hath done. For Fire and Spirit against its nature He hath mingled, and hath poured them into the fists of His disciples. He asked, who hath bound the waters in a garment? Lo! the Fountain in a garment, the lap of

Mary ! From the Cup of Life the distilling of life in the midst of the garment do thine handmaids take.

“O might hidden in the veil of the sanctuary, that might which the mind never conceives, It hath his love brought down ; and It hath descended and brooded over the veil of the altar of propitiation. Lo ! Fire and Spirit in the bosom of her that bare Thee. Lo ! Fire and Spirit in that river wherein Thou wert baptized, Fire and Spirit in our baptism ! In the Bread and the Cup is Fire and the Holy Ghost. Thy Bread killeth the greedy one who had made us his bread ; Thy Cup destroyeth death, which swallowed us up. We have eaten Thee, O Lord, yea, we have drunken Thee, not that we shall make Thee fail, but that we might have life in Thee.” *

He says, then, addressing our Lord Jesus Christ : “ In Thy Bread is hidden the Spirit that cannot be eaten. In Thy Wine there dwelleth the Fire that cannot be drunk.” And again : “ Ye eat the Fire in the Bread, and are quickened.” “ In the Bread and the Cup are Fire and the Holy Ghost.” “ We, O Lord, have eaten Thy Fire in Thy oblation.” “ The bread covereth the Fire which dwells therein.” And these passages are proposed as proofs of “ The Real Presence,” that is, of “ The Real Objective Presence ” of our Lord’s glorified body in, or under the form of, the bread and wine. But in order to make them prove this, it will have to be shown that by “ Fire ” and by “ The Spirit,” this writer meant our Lord’s glorified body. And this does not appear to be the case. On the contrary, it appears clearly from another place, that by “ Fire ” he meant our Lord’s Divine nature : for he says :—

“Glorious and hidden was His entering in : vile and visible His coming forth, for He was God in His going in, and Man in His coming forth. A wonder and an astonishment to hear ! Fire went into the Belly, and clothed Himself with a Body and came forth.” †

And in another place, he makes Fire to be “ threefold ; ” and an emblem of God the Father “ enrolling heat—as a type of the Son, and—light as a type of the Spirit : ” ‡

“ Three names are seen in the fire, and each one standeth singly in its sway ; and each one in its functions is seen distinctly ; single powers, and yet they are blended together. The fire marvellously, and the heat distinctly, and the light gloriously, dwell at unity in one another.” §

And again, in another place, we see an illustration of his meaning, when he speaks of our Lord’s Fire in the bread, and the cup, and the Spirit in both :—

* Select Works of St. Ephrem the Syrian, Oxford, 1847, 145-147.

† Rhythms upon the Faith, 4th Rhythm, Oxford, 1847, 115.

‡ Rhythm 40, p. 233.

§ 234.

“If then this fire be of a miraculous nature,—that passeth through everything, and grudgeth not; that flieth into bread, and blends itself with water, and dwelleth in everything, while the whole thereof dwelleth in it: a symbol of the Spirit is in it, yea, a type of the Holy Spirit, who is mingled in water that it may become a propitiation, and is blended with bread that it may become a Sacrifice: and though He seemeth to be entirely in all of them, His fulness is far removed. For it is not possible to shadow forth the mysteries of the Trinity.” *

Thus he regarded the fire by which common bread was baked, as a figure of divine fire or power imparted to the consecrated bread, hidden and dwelling in it: but nothing appears to intimate the notion of our Lord’s presence in his human nature in the bread; for he did not call our Lord’s human nature by the name of Fire.

But the places cited by Dr. Pusey contain a Key for their own interpretation. St. Ephrem says, “Fire and Spirit in that river wherein Thou wert baptized, Fire and Spirit in our baptism. In the bread and the Cup is Fire and the Holy Ghost.” And in these three sentences, “Fire” and “Spirit” must have the same meaning. Therefore, if Fire and Spirit in the bread and the Cup, mean “The Real Presence” in these elements, “Fire and Spirit in the river,” “Fire and Spirit in our baptism,” must mean it also. But as it will not be pretended that there was “The Real Presence” of our Lord’s body in the water with which He was baptized, or that “The Real Presence” is in the water of our baptism; it necessarily follows, that the expression “In the bread and the Cup is Fire and the Holy Ghost,” cannot be a proof of “The Real Presence” in the bread and wine. Neither can it be maintained that “the Holy Ghost” is contained in them; which would, however, follow, if our Lord’s “Real Presence” were in the bread and the Cup: for “the Holy Ghost” is said by St. Ephrem to be “in the bread and the Cup,” as well as “Fire.”

And from the expressions: “Thy garment is a fountain of medicines. In thy visible vesture there dwelleth an hidden power. A little spittle from thy mouth became also a great miracle of light in the midst of its clay:” we may see, that, when he immediately added: “In thy bread is hidden the Spirit that cannot be eaten; in thy wine there dwelleth the fire that cannot be drunk;” if, as has been proved above, “The Real Presence” was not meant, it is a divine power or virtue which was intended.

ST. EPHREM.

This writer believed the bread of the Eucharist to be the body, and the wine to be the blood, of Christ: for he said that "He brake His body and divided His blood;" that the Priests "consecrate the body and blood;" that they "distribute His body and His blood."* And he did not conceive that the bread was his body and blood together, or that the wine was his blood and his body together; as the doctrine of "The Real Presence" in reality has it: but he believed the Lord's body and blood in the Eucharist to be as separate and distinct from each other, as the bread and wine are from each other. He said, "He brake His body before thee, and mingled His blood and gave it thee."† And again: "The Spirit in Thy bread, and the Fire in Thy Cup, are distinct miracles."

Before we finish with this writer, we must notice one or two other places. He says:—

"One sitting may not receive the living Body:" "The righteous, with sinners, fill themselves with the living Body which is on the Altar:"

from which some might be disposed to argue that St. Ephrem believed that we receive the glorified body, since the living body is glorified. But this cannot be his meaning; for he says in another place of "the departed," they "ate of Thy body and drank of Thy living blood." And again he says, "I have received from the hands of the Priests, Thy living body and Thine atoning blood." And yet again, this was not by receiving the Lord's body and blood both in one living body, but separately: for he also says: "If we have sinned,—do Thou turn us to repentance, Who hast fed us with Thy Body, and given us Thy living Blood to drink."

"ST. EPIPHANIUS says,—

"The Bread indeed is food, but the might *in* it is for giving of life."‡ But neither is this a proof of "The Real Presence" of our Lord Himself in it. Nor do I suppose that it could be really offered as a proof of it: without previous proof that by "might," St. Epiphanius intended "The Real Presence."

ST. AUGUSTINE is cited,—but I find no reference where the words are to be found,—as saying:—

"Receive ye that *in* the Bread, which hung on the Cross; receive ye that in the Cup, which flowed from the Side."

* Pusey, 414, 416.

† Id. 419.

‡ 133.

And:—

“Our Lord Jesus Christ commended His Body and Blood *in* those things which are, out of many [grains and many grapes], reduced into some one.”*

Now it is unnecessary to show that St. Augustine believed that the bread of the Eucharist is our Lord’s body, and the wine his blood. And from the first of these places, it is clear, that he conceived the body and the blood to be distinct and separate from each other: in the bread, the body which hung on the cross; in the cup, the blood which flowed from the side: and, therefore, that he conceived it to be our Lord’s body crucified and dead; not his glorified body.

The same remarks serve for these passages from ST. CHRYSOSTOM:—

“This which is *in* the Cup is that which flowed from the Side, and thereof do we partake:”—“the blood *in* the Cup is drawn for Thy cleansing, from the undefiled Side.”

And they will serve also for this of ST. CYPRIAN:—

“Nor can His Blood whereby we have been redeemed and quickened, appear to be *in* the Cup, when the Cup is without that wine, whereby the Blood of Christ is *set forth*, as is declared by the mystical meaning and testimony of all the Scriptures.”

And again on this of BEDE:—

“The poor, i.e. those who despise the world, shall eat really, if this be referred to the Sacraments, and shall be satisfied eternally, because *in* the bread and wine visibly set before them, they shall understand another invisible thing, i.e. the very Body and Blood, which are true meat and drink, wherewith not the belly is distended, but the mind is enriched:”

it is to be remarked, first, that Bede does not say that “the very body and blood” of Christ are in the bread and wine; but that “in the bread and wine they shall understand the very body and blood:” secondly, that by “the very body and blood,” he could not mean our Lord’s glorified body, but his body and his blood separately, as the bread and wine, their symbols, were separate; for none had ever thought, at least, none of the orthodox had ever thought, with approval of the Church, that they received the body and blood of the Lord in living union.

The distinction made above, and elsewhere in this work,

* Doctrine of the Real Presence, p. 132. Sermon, p. 40.

between "is, and "shall understand," or "is understood," is by no means trivial: for the argument and conclusion, so far, depend on it. It is illustrated by the well-known saying of St. Augustine, that, in the Sacraments, "one thing is seen, another is understood." He was explaining to youthful hearers, how it was that "the bread is the body of Christ, and the cup his blood," since the body of Christ which was born "of the Virgin Mary—was crucified, rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and was to come again to judge the quick and the dead, is now sitting at the right hand of the Father." But he did not show or explain how the bread was the body of Christ, and the wine his blood, by the powers of his glorified body, as he must have done, if he had had any thought of "The Real Presence." Instead of this, he said:—

"That which is seen has a corporal species; that which is understood has spiritual fruit. If therefore you wish to understand the body of Christ, hear the Apostle saying to the faithful, 'Now ye are the body of Christ, and members.' If therefore ye are the body of Christ and members, your mystery is placed on the Lord's Table; ye receive your mystery. To that which ye are, ye answer, Amen; and by answering give your assent. For thou hearest, the body of Christ; and thou answerest, Amen. Be a member of the body of Christ; that your Amen be true.—Be ye that which ye see [our bread], and receive that which ye are."⁷⁴

No believer in "The Real Presence" would ever have written in this way.

Dr. Pusey says that "the term '*in,*' as used by the Fathers, does not express any local inclusion of the Body and Blood of Christ; it denotes their presence there after the manner of a Sacrament." But I must take leave to think, that, if "it denotes their presence there," it must "express local inclusion."⁷⁵ For where is their "presence" supposed to be

⁷⁴ "Dominus noster Jesus Christus, novimus unde acceperit carnem, de Virgine Maria. In ligno interfectus est,—tertia die resurrexit,—in cœlum ascendit; illic levavit corpus suum; inde est venturus ut judicet vivos et mortuos; ibi est modo sedens ad dexteram Patris: quomodo est panis corpus ejus! Et calix, vel quod habet calix, quomodo est sanguis ejus! Ista, fratres, ideo dicuntur Sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur, speciem habet corporalem; quod intelligitur, fructum habet spiritualem. Corpus ergo Christi si vis intelligere, Apostolum audi dicentem fidelibus, 'Vos autem estis corpus Christi, et membra' (1 Cor. xii. 27). Si ergo vos estis corpus Christi et membra, mysterium vestrum in mensa dominica positum est: mysterium vestrum accipitis. Ad id quod estis, Amen respondetis, et respondendo subscribitis. Audis enim corpus Christi: et respondes, Amen. Esto membrum corporis Christi, ut verum sit Amen. Estote quod videtis (1 Cor. x. 17) et accipite quod estis."—Serm. 272.

⁷⁵ St. Augustine says: "Nam spatia locorum tolle corporibus, nusquam erunt; et quia nusquam erunt, nec erunt. Take away from the bodies local spaces, and they shall be nowhere; and because they shall be nowhere, they shall not be."—Ep. ad Dard. vi.; Migne, ii. 838.

denoted? Is it not "in" the bread, the bread and the wine, so as it is not in the Paten or the Cup, the Table or its cover; and so as to be received in the bread and the wine? It is a presence limited to the dimensions of the bread and wine. And if this be not "local inclusion," it would be difficult indeed to define what is. The phrase "after the manner of a Sacrament" seems to be sufficient with some to remove every difficulty. But I must say that I think it is very inconsiderately used. For what is the manner of a Sacrament? what is a presence after the manner of a Sacrament? It refers, of course, to the inward part of a Sacrament, or thing signified, the inward and spiritual grace, which, with the outward sign, is the complete Sacrament. Now as the Church of England acknowledges only two "Sacraments of the Gospel," we must suppose that when a Minister of that Church speaks about "the manner of a Sacrament," he intends these two, and these only. Dr. Pusey, therefore, must be understood to mean that it is "the manner" of these two Sacraments to have their inward part present in the outward. But in one of these Sacraments, this, most undoubtedly, is not the case. The inward part is not present in the outward part of Baptism. "A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness," which our Catechism determines to be "the inward and spiritual grace," or the inward part of the Sacrament, is not present in the water which is the outward part. That grace is not "there in order that it may be received." It is an operation by One who is present, according to his promise to be with his disciples always in the ministry He has laid upon them. But there is no presence of the inward part in the outward. Such a presence is not "after the manner" of this Sacrament.

Then, to talk of the inward part of the other Sacrament being present in the outward, call it local or non-local inclusion, or what you may, "after the manner of a Sacrament," is, in reality, to beg the question. It is but saying that it is "after the manner" of the Sacrament of the Eucharist for the inward part to be present in the outward, and therefore it is present. There is no such presence in the other Sacrament, from which a like presence in this may be inferred. And therefore it is plain to demonstration, that it is not "the manner of the Sacraments," that there should be a presence of the inward in the outward part.

The Council of Trent, indeed, anathematised those who say

"that the Sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they signify;"⁷⁶ but the Canons of that Assembly have no authority in the Church of England, nor with any who hold true Catholic doctrine.

"Gerhard observes," Dr. Pusey however pleads, "that Holy Scripture says, 'Christ dwells in our hearts by faith,' Eph. iii. 17; 'God walketh in us,' 2 Cor. vi. 16; 'The Holy Spirit dwelleth in us,' 1 Cor. xiii. 16. Holy Scripture does hereby tell us, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost actually dwell *in* us." And this in-dwelling, he says, "does not, of course, imply local inclusion." There can, certainly, be no local inclusion of the Infinite: though there may be a presence of the Infinite within a place, and therefore included in it; a presence of holiness, as in the temple: a presence of power: a presence of favour and love, as in the hearts of God's faithful people: a presence so included there, as not to be extended to others who may be even in bodily contact with them.

But the impossibility of a strictly "local inclusion" of the Infinite, cannot prove or illustrate the presence of a finite body without "local inclusion." It will illustrate a scriptural and, it may be, a Patristic, use of "the term *in*," but cannot help to prove the use of the term for the presence of a finite body in the bread and wine of the Eucharist without "local inclusion."

On the whole, then, to adopt Dr. Pusey's own words,—“the Fathers—assert, continually, that what is consecrated, and what we receive, are the Body and Blood of Christ,—spiritually, sacramentally, Divinely, mystically, ineffably, through the operation of the Word of Christ, and of God the Holy Ghost.” And, “in this meaning, they do speak of the objective presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, as following upon the consecration. This they teach unvaryingly from the times of the Apostles, as strongly and as distinctly as any other portion of the Faith.”*

But they do not teach “The Real Objective Presence” of our Lord's glorified body, in, with, or under, the bread and wine, or their form. They do not teach the real presence of the Lord's glorified body in the Eucharist. They do not teach that the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ, by having or containing, or having the presence of his

⁷⁶ “Si quis dixerit Sacramenta Novæ Legis non continere gratiam quam significant, —anathema sit.”—Sess. 7, can. 6.

* Sermon on the Presence of Christ, pp. 46, 47.

body and blood, either separately, or in living union. They teach that the consecrated bread is the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for us, and that the consecrated wine is his blood which was shed for us : and as Dr. Pusey rightly says, that they meant that the consecrated elements “are the Body and Blood of Christ,—ineffably ;” they did not conceive or explain this by any mode of presence in, with, or under them, or under their form.

Let the reader, remembering that the doctrine of “The Real Objective Presence,” is, in the Roman form, that whole Christ,—his glorified body, therefore,—is contained under the species, the outward form and appearance, of the bread, and also of the wine :—in the Lutheran form, that “the glorious body” of our Lord is in, with, or under, the bread and wine :—and in the Tractarian form, that our Lord’s glorified body, “the Body of God,” is present in the consecrated elements : in one word, that these several doctrines all teach “The Real Objective Presence” of our Lord’s glorified body in, or with, the bread—and—wine, or under their form : and placing this brief statement of the doctrine of “The Real Presence,” side by side, with the extracts which have been, or may be produced from the Fathers ; he will see that those venerable authorities give no sanction to this doctrine : but that, for well-nigh a thousand years, they proclaim with one voice their belief in our Lord’s words, when He said of the bread, “This—is—my body which is given for you : This—is—my blood which is shed for you :” a belief which Doctor Pusey again and again states and acknowledges, but strangely converts into the belief of his own very different, and self-contradictory doctrine.

CHAPTER XV.

THE TEACHING OF THE DIVINES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

I HAVE stated my opinion that the term "Real Presence," as applied to the inward part of the Eucharist, was not used till the era of the Reformation, when the disciples of Huss asserted that "the words of our Lord Jesus Christ—said nothing of the Real Presence."

The term had, no doubt, been used in the communication, or charge, to which they were making answer, and may therefore have had a somewhat earlier origin. But we know that, some years afterwards, our Reformers, Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, complained of the "new terms" which were used in the controversy with them on this Sacrament.

A brief account, however, of the history of the term will not be without interest and importance.

The first mention * which I find of the word "Presence," in connection with the Eucharist, is in these words of "ST. GAUDENTIUS OF BRESCIA:" "Truly this is the hereditary gift of His New Testament, which He left us in that night when He was betrayed to be crucified, as a pledge of His Presence. This is that food for our journey, whereby in this journey of life we are fed and nourished, until, departing from this world, we go forth unto Himself." †

ST. CHRYSOSTOM says: "What dost thou, O man, when Christ is present, when the Angels stand by, when this awful Table is before you?"—"It is time to approach the awful Table.—Christ is present now too. The same Who adorned that Table, adorneth it now. For it is not man who maketh what lieth there to become the Body and Blood of Christ, but Christ Himself."—"When thou art about to approach the Holy Table, think that there the king of all is present; for He is present indeed, observing the mind of all, and seeth *who* approacheth with befitting holiness, and who, with an evil conscience."—"There

* I cite from Dr. Pusey, as I suppose he has not omitted any places in which our Lord's presence might seem to be spoken of.

† P. 490.

is the Sacrifice in hand, and all things laid out duly ordered. Angels are there present, Archangels, the Son of God is there."*

ST. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA says: "Besides this clear knowledge, ye have the feast, the presence of God, the celebration of the dread Sacrifice."—"If indeed, the Body of God is given them, here is very God, Christ the Lord."†

ST. LEO says: "Our Lord Jesus Christ is present (as we confess not rashly, but faithfully) in the midst of the faithful; and although He sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, 'until He make His enemies His footstool,' yet is not the great High Priest absent from the assembly of His saints."‡

Thus far I have found in Doctor Pusey's work. In the work of Albertinus, I find ODO, BISHOP OF PARIS, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, to have said: "Let the linen cloths and vestments of the altar be often washed, for the reverence and presence of our Saviour and of the whole court of heaven, which is present with Him as often as Mass is celebrated."§

And L'Arroque says, that John of Paris in the beginning of the fourteenth century—in reference to "the Retraction of Berengarius under Nicholas the Second; to wit, *That the Body of Jesus Christ is broken by the hands of the Priest, and ground by the teeth of believers; not only in the Sacrament, but in the verity itself;*" explains by the "Communication of Idioms," the expression that "*The Bread is the Body of Jesus Christ, the presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, and the eating of His Flesh.*" John said that there is "a true and real existence of the body of Christ in the Sacrament of the altar," either by "commutation of the substance of the bread into the body of Christ," or "by assumption of the substance of the bread or the paniety in Christ:" and the Faculty of Theology of Paris determined that either of these ways was "a probable opinion," since "no mode had been determined by the Church," and neither was an article of faith.||

Thus it appears that the word "Presence" began to be used in reference to the Eucharist in the end of the fourth century: but in a very different sense from that in which it is now employed. Gaudentius speaks of the Eucharist "as a pledge of our Lord's Presence:" Chrysostom says that "He is

* Ibid. pp. 553, 555, 564, 577.
§ P. 969.

† P. 650.

‡ Pp. 694, 695.

|| P. 490, 491.

present, observing the mind of all:" Leo says that "He is present in the midst of the faithful."

Odo, in the thirteenth century, speaks of "the presence of our Saviour and of the whole court of heaven:" and John of Paris, a hundred years after, says: "the bread is the body of Jesus Christ, the presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament:" that is, "the bread" being "the body of Jesus Christ," is "the presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament," or "a true and real existence of the body of Christ in the Sacrament."

Up to the fourteenth century, then, the presence of Christ was spoken of in that sense in which He promised, "where two or three are gathered together, there am I in the midst of them;" and "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." But at this time, we find that "a true and real existence of Christ," and his "presence, in the Sacrament," was believed. And yet this was not such a presence as the term "Real Presence" means. It was a presence of Christ, by means of the bread which is the body of Christ. It was not a presence in the bread, or under its form. "The bread," John said—"is the presence."

The term "Real Presence" is not, I believe from a careful search, to be found in Aquinas; neither is it in the Lateran Decree which was issued just before his time. The Decree runs thus: "There is one universal Church of the faithful, out of which no one whatever is saved: in which the self same Jesus Christ is Himself Priest and Sacrifice, whose body and blood are truly contained in the Sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine, by transubstantiation of the bread into the body, and of the wine into the blood, by the power of God, that for the accomplishment of the mystery of unity, we ourselves may take of His, that which He Himself took of ours."⁷⁷

Whether the term "Real Presence" was used in the fifteenth century, I have no means at hand of ascertaining: but enough has been advanced to show, that it was unknown till the era of the Reformation, and some considerable time after the doctrine of Transubstantiation had been proclaimed by the fourth Lateran Council. Indeed, comparing the terms in which the Decree of this Council runs, with the Decree of Trent, we may see that

⁷⁷ "Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur. In qua idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus, ejus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipimus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro."

the doctrine must have been considerably developed towards its final enunciation by the later Council, before the term could have been adopted into use.

The Lateran Decree says that the body and blood of our Lord are truly contained under the species of bread and wine in the Sacrament, by the transubstantiation of the bread into his body, and of the wine into his blood. And "The Real Presence," the real presence of our Lord's glorified body is much beyond this. It could not have been used until the doctrine of the Council of Constance in the fifteenth century, which determined that "the whole body and blood of Christ are truly contained as well under the species of bread, as under the species of wine," had been ready to be developed into the doctrine propounded at Trent, that the term "Real Presence" was used with reference to the Eucharist. But when it came to be believed, as the Council of Trent teaches, that not only by the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and the existence of the whole body and blood of Christ under its species; but that "by concomitance" and "hypostatic union," "whole Christ," "our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things;" then, and then only, could the term, "Real Presence," have been used,—in the signification, at least, which is attached to it in the Roman, Lutheran, and Tractarian systems.

Thus the term, "Real Presence," was begotten of false doctrine, and is expressive of it.

How, then, it may be pleaded by some,—how has it come that the great Divines of the Church of England, since the Reformation, have accepted the term, and acknowledged or defended the doctrine it expresses, even when they have been contending against the doctrine of Rome? The question is natural and fair; and it must, as it well can, be answered.

That there has been a use of the term by Post-reformation divines of the Church of England, is certainly not to be denied: but with the exception of a few in these days, there has not been any acceptance of the doctrine which it properly expresses.

And the use of the term is accounted for by its ambiguity, taken by itself: for it may have these several distinct senses: first, it may signify the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ in

his Divine nature: secondly, his presence in his human nature, the presence of his glorified body, and therefore of his soul and Divine nature: and thirdly, the presence of his body which was given for us, and of his blood which was shed for us.

And in the first of these senses, our Lord's glorified body, though absent from the earth, and enthroned at the right hand of the Father in heaven, may have an effectual presence upon the earth, by reason of his Godhead.

But the term may be called relative: for the notion of presence necessarily involves the idea of some person, thing, or place, to or in which the presence is conceived.

In the first sense, then, of the term "Real Presence," our Lord is present everywhere: He is present where two or three are gathered together in his name: He is present to his ministers in the work which He has appointed for them: He is present in the Church which is his body: He is present in the Sacraments.

In the second sense, He is present in heaven: and He is alleged to be present in the celebration of the Eucharist; or in the bread and wine, or under the forms of the bread and wine, in the Eucharist.

In the third sense, He is said to be present, by the bread which is his body, and the wine which is his blood: and where these are, He is said to be.

In recollection, then, of these different senses of the term "Real Presence," we shall be prepared to consider the use of it by Post-reformation writers of the Church of England, and the allegation that they have acknowledged or defended the doctrine which the term was originally intended to express.

And here, again, I cannot do better than avail myself of the *Catena*, which Doctor Pusey has appended to his Sermon, "The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent:" for I must conclude, that though he may have omitted many writers altogether, and many passages from those whom he has admitted, he has not allowed anything to escape him which might serve his argument, and has given fair specimens of the doctrine of all whom he has cited.

Premising, then, that of those divines whom Doctor Pusey has cited, I shall not notice any from whose works passages not sufficiently pertinent to the matter in hand are given; we begin with—

BISHOP RIDLEY.

He says in his last examination before the Commissioners :*—

“Both you and I agree herein, that in the sacrament is the very true and natural body and blood of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into heaven, which sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead; only we differ *in modo*, in the way and manner of being: we confess all one thing to be in the sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there. I, being fully by God’s word thereunto persuaded, confess Christ’s natural body to be in the sacrament indeed by spirit and grace, because that whosoever receiveth worthily that bread and wine receiveth effectuously Christ’s body, and drinketh his blood (that is, he is made effectually partaker of his passion); and you make a grosser kind of being, enclosing a natural, a lively, and a moving body, under the shape or form of bread and wine. Now this difference considered, to the question † thus I answer, that in the sacrament of the altar is the natural body and blood of Christ, *vere et realiter*, indeed and really, for spiritually, by grace and efficacy: for so every worthy receiver receiveth the very true body of Christ. But if you mean really and indeed, so that thereby you would include a lively and a moveable body under the forms of bread and wine, then, in that sense, is not Christ’s body in the sacrament really and indeed.

“Think not because I disallow that presence which the first proposition ‡ maintaineth (as a presence which I take to be forged, phantastical, and, beside the authority of God’s word, perniciously brought into the Church by the Romanists), that I therefore go about to take away the true presence of Christ’s body in his supper rightly and duly ministered, which is grounded upon the word of God, and made more plain by the commentaries of the faithful fathers.—I will in few words declare, what true presence of Christ’s body in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper I hold and affirm, with the word of God and the ancient fathers.

“I say and confess with the evangelist Luke, and with the Apostle Paul, that the bread on which thanks are given, is the body of Christ in the remembrance of him and his death, to be set forth perpetually of the faithful until his coming.

“I say and confess, the bread which we break to be the communion, and partaking of Christ’s body, with the ancient and the faithful fathers.

“I say and believe, that there is not only a signification of Christ’s body set forth by the sacrament, but also that therewith is given to the godly and faithful the grace of Christ’s body, that is, the food of life and immortality. And this I hold with Cyprian.

* I cite from the edition which Doctor Pusey used, but prefer to follow its punctuation and small letters.

† “That the true and natural body of Christ, after the consecration of the priest, is not really present in the sacrament of the altar.”

‡ “In the Sacrament of the altar, by the virtue of God’s word spoken by the priest, the natural body of Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, and his natural blood, are really present under the forms of bread and wine.”—P. 194.

“I say also with St. Augustine, that we eat life and we drink life; with Emissene, that we feel the Lord to be present in grace; with Athanasius, that we receive celestial food, which cometh from above; the property of natural communion with Hilary; the nature of flesh, and benediction which giveth life, in bread and wine with Cyril; and with the same Cyril, the virtue of the very flesh of Christ, life and grace of his body, the property of the only begotten, that is to say, life; as he himself in plain words expoundeth it.

“I confess also with Basil, that we receive the mystical advent and coming of Christ, grace and the virtue of his very nature; the sacrament of his very flesh, with Ambrose; the body by grace with Epiphanius; spiritual flesh, but not that which was crucified, with Jerome; grace flowing into a sacrifice, and the grace of the Spirit, with Chrysostom; grace and invisible verity, grace and society of the members of Christ's body, with Augustine.

“Finally, with Bertram (who was the last of all these), I confess that Christ's body is in the sacrament in this respect; namely, as he writeth, because there is in it the Spirit of Christ, that is, the power of the word of God, which not only feedeth the soul, but also cleanseth it. Out of these I suppose it may clearly appear unto all men, how far we are from that opinion, whereof some go about falsely to slander us to the world, saying, we teach that the godly and faithful should receive nothing else at the Lord's table, but a figure of the body of Christ.”*

To these places extracted by Doctor Pusey, I must add one or two more, in order to show the Bishop's opinion more clearly. He says of the Roman doctrine, that it

“Maintaineth a real, corporal, and carnal presence of Christ's flesh, assumed and taken of the word, to be in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that not by virtue and grace only, but also by the whole essence and substance of the body and flesh of Christ.”* “If he be now really present in the body of his flesh, then must the supper cease.”† “In a sense the first article is true, and in a sense it is false: for if you take *really* for *vere*, for spiritually, by grace and efficacy, then it is true that the natural body and blood of Christ is in the sacrament *vere et realiter*, indeed and really; but if you take these terms so grossly, that you would conclude thereby a natural body having motion to be contained under the forms of bread and wine, *vere et realiter*, then really is not the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, no more than the Holy Ghost is in Baptism.’ ‡ And again:

* P. 197.

† P. 199.

‡ P. 273. In like manner Archbishop Cranmer said: “If ye understand by the word ‘really,’ *re ipsa*, i.e. in very deed and effectually, so Christ, by the grace and efficacy of his passion, is indeed and truly present to all his true and holy members. But if ye understand by this word ‘really,’ *corporaliter*, i.e. ‘corporally,’ so that by the body of Christ is understood a natural body and organical; so the first proposition doth vary, not only from usual speech and phrase of Scripture, but also is clean contrary to the holy word of God and christian profession: whereas both the Scripture doth testify by these words, and also the catholic church hath professed from the

‘inasmuch as they [the bread and wine] are sanctified, and made the sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord, they have a promise of grace annexed unto them; namely, of spiritual partaking of the body of Christ to be communicated and given, not to the bread and wine, but to them which worthily receive the sacrament.’

“This sacrament hath a promise of grace, made to those that receive it worthily, because grace is given by it, as by an instrument, not that Christ hath transferred grace into the bread and wine.”*

Bishop Ridley, then, was careful to avoid the two extremes of the Roman and the Zuinglian doctrines. He denied the doctrine which “would include a natural, a lively, and a moving body, under the shape or form of bread and wine:” and he denied the opposite doctrine “that the godly and faithful should receive nothing else at the Lord’s table, but a figure of Christ’s body.” And the mean which he accepted between these extremes was a presence of “Christ’s natural body in the Sacrament—spiritually by grace and efficacy;” not a presence of “the whole essence and substance of the body and flesh of Christ,” but a presence “by virtue and grace only.”

This he called “a true presence,” in contradistinction to the “Real Presence” of the Romanists.

And he acknowledged a true presence for these reasons:—

1. “That the bread on the which thanks are given is the body of Christ.”
2. That “the bread which we break” is “the communion of the body of Christ.”
3. That it is “made a lively presentation of Christ’s body, and not only a figure, but effectuously representeth his body.”
4. “That therewith is given to the godly and faithful the grace of Christ’s body:” so that “whosoever receiveth worthily that bread and wine, receiveth effectually Christ’s body and drinketh his blood.”

And as he agreed with the Romanists, “that in the Sacrament is the very true and natural body and blood of Christ,” it is that very true and natural body and blood which they that receive worthily, effectually receive and drink: but this not by a presence under the form of bread and wine, not by grace “communicated and given” to them, or “transfused into” them; but by a true presence in the Sacrament “by virtue and grace only.” For he said in another place: “If you take the

beginning, Christ to have left the world, and to sit at the right hand of the Father till he come unto judgment.”—Explication exhibited in the Disputations at Oxford, Writings and Disputations, Cambridge, 1844, 395.

* Pp. 240, 241.

real presence of Christ according to the real and corporal substance which he took of the Virgin, that presence being in heaven cannot be on the earth also. But if you mean a real presence, ‘secundum rem aliquam quæ ad corpus Christi pertinet,’ i.e. according to something that appertaineth to Christ’s body, certes the ascension and abiding in heaven are no let at all to that presence. Wherefore Christ’s body after that sort, is here present to us in the Lord’s Supper; by grace, I say, as Epiphanius speaketh it.”*

We find, then, that Bishop Ridley did not use the term “Real Presence,” to express his own doctrine: and that he chose the term, “True Presence,” for that purpose. And so far as he admitted the use of the former, it was with a protest against that sense of the term which the Romanists affixed to it. He rejected the doctrine which it originally and properly expressed. And the true presence which he maintained was a presence “in the sacrament,” not in the bread and wine or under their “shape or form.”

And lastly, since Bishop Ridley disallowed the real presence of “a natural, a lively, and a moving body, under the forms of bread and wine,” he thereby disallowed the presence of our Lord’s glorified body under these forms; as he said in another place, that such a presence “is contrary to the word of God,—varieth from the articles of the faith” which confess the Lord’s ascension into heaven, his session there with the Father until He shall come again unto judgment,—“and destroyeth and taketh away the institution of the Lord’s Supper.”†

I have dwelt at some length on the opinion of Bishop Ridley, because I think that most of our divines who have used the term “Real Presence,” have used it in his sense, rather than in the sense in which Doctor Pusey seems to take it.

The words of Bishop Ridley—

“Both you and I agree herein, that in the sacrament is the very true, and natural body and blood of Christ;—only we differ *in modo*, in the way and manner of being,”

are echoed by BISHOP MONTAGU, who says:—

“The disagreement is only *de modo presentie*, the thing is yielded to on either side, and there is in the Holy Eucharist a real Presence.”

* Ibid. 213.

† Pp. 198, 199.

And BISHOP BILSON says :—

“God forbid we should deny that the Flesh and Blood of Christ are truly present and truly received of the faithful at the Lord’s table.”

But on the other hand he says :—

“Both your real presence is overthrown, and the doctrine which we teach is clearly established. For we confess that Christ worketh in us, and presenteth himself unto us in these mysteries, as it were in certain veils and coverings; which mystically by way of signification and spiritual operation, contain and clothe his grace and truth; but not really, nor by material or corporal inclusion, as you affirm.—Christ is signified and received by these signs and figures,—but that Christ is locally or substantially closed within the forms of bread and wine—Dionysius hath no such sense nor words.”—“The sacred Scriptures and Catholic Fathers affirm, that the true flesh of Christ is absent from earth, and verily present in heaven.” “These be no wrested or maimed allegations, but grave and advised authorities of learned and ancient Fathers, plainly concluding with us against you, that the flesh of Christ is not absent only from earth, and now sitteth above at the right hand of God, but also locally contained in some one place of heaven by reason of the truth of his body: and therefore not dispersed in many places or present in every place, as you would now make the world believe it is in your masses.” *

These three Bishops agreed with the Romanists in a true presence of the same thing, the true body or flesh and blood of Christ: but they differed from them “in the way and manner of being:” Ridley and Bilson clearly denying the presence in the elements. It will therefore be a fit place here to consider what this phrase means; what “modes,” “ways and manners of being,” or presence, there are, or may be conceived, of the true body and blood of Christ. But it is necessary, first, to ascertain what is meant by “the body and blood of Christ;” for the term is, and has been, most commonly used with a very vague and inaccurate impression of its meaning; although legitimately it can have but one meaning, that one meaning in which our Lord spoke the words at the institution of the Eucharist. In his meaning, as has been demonstrated, it is his body which was given for us, and his blood which was shed for us, his dead body, and his outpoured blood, separately one from the other. Whereas, in common use it is supposed to mean, the Lord’s body and blood together, his blood in his body, his body as it now actually is, living and glorified.

* The True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion, Lond. 1586, pp. 716, 717, 640, 649: cited by Dean Goode, ii. 798, 802, 803.

Now if the true sense of the term, "the body and blood of Christ," be, his body given, and his blood shed, for us: there can be but one mode, way, or manner of their presence. For as his body and blood are no longer in the condition which "given and shed" signify, a "real objective presence" of them is impossible. There can be no such presence of that which is not. They can be present only "in remembrance:" and they are made present to the soul through faith by the bread and wine.

But when the term "the body and blood of Christ," is used for the incarnate person of our Lord Himself, as He now is; then "the Real Presence" "there" where the Sacrament is celebrated, must be understood to be either in or external to the elements, or with them, or under their forms: or else it would be "spiritual," that is, "by grace, virtue, or efficacy only;" the Lord Jesus being in his human nature in heaven only, but imparting the grace of that nature on earth through his Divine nature.

The former kind of presence, whether by Transubstantiation, or Consubstantiation, or whatsoever other conditions, Bishop Ridley calls "a carnal presence," not meaning the word in any but a physical sense. And he rightly calls it "carnal:" for the alleged presence is of the body and blood of Christ: and if it be a real presence, it must be a presence of his flesh, in the flesh; and therefore fleshly, and therefore carnal. The actual real presence of a body, must be bodily or corporal: the actual real presence of a fleshly body, must be fleshly or carnal: and if it is not a carnal presence, it is no real presence of the body at all. And though our Lord's body is now glorified and spiritual, it is a human body still, it is a body of flesh still; ⁷⁸ for He has not abandoned his manhood. And nothing can have a real actual presence divested of its nature. If it be divested of its nature, it cannot be present anywhere: ⁷⁹ and the presence is not of it, but of something else.

"The Real Presence" is, indeed called "spiritual" and "supernatural:" and it seems to be imagined that by these quali-

⁷⁸ "[Carni] profecto immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit. He has indeed given immortality to his flesh, but has not taken away its nature."—August. *ibid.* iii. 10; Migne, ii. 835.

⁷⁹ "Tolle ipsa corpora qualitatibus corporum, non erit ubi sint, et ideo necesse est ut non sint. Take away bodies from the qualities of bodies, and there shall not be where they can be, and therefore it is necessary that they be not."—August. *Ep. ad Dardan.* vi.; Migne, ii. 838. "The substance of the body of Christ hath no presence neither can have, but only local."—Hooker, v. 55.

fications, the doctrine is relieved from some serious objections. Possibly it may be: but to me it appears that, instead of maintaining the doctrine, they rather explain it away. For I would desire those who satisfy themselves of "The Real Presence," and think to commend it to the belief of others, by the employment of such words, to consider, and to remember their own protest, that "The Real Presence" means not the virtual, but the actual presence of a real human body, though it be spiritual, heavenly, and glorious; and not the presence of a bare, incorporeal spirit. And also that, though the real presence of an incorporeal spirit may be spiritual; the actual real presence of an embodied spirit cannot be spiritual in the sense in which the word spiritual must be intended in connection with "The Real Presence." The actual real presence of a body must be bodily and corporeal: the actual real presence of a body of flesh must be fleshly or carnal: and so far not spiritual.

The actual real presence of such a body, spiritually, seems to me so supernatural as to be self-contradictory in words, and impossible in fact; and to amount only to a virtual or efficacious presence. Indeed, whatsoever epithets may be applied to "The Real Presence,"—sacramental, spiritual, Divine, mystical, ineffable, "they too often seem only to oppress reason and faith; while they are a virtual" negation of the actual reality of the presence "there" of that which is intended. Surely a spiritual presence, merely, of a fleshly, though spiritual body, is a contradiction to its reality. To call it "Divine" savours of a denial of "the verity of the Lord's body."⁸⁰ To call it sacramental, is but in reality, to beg the question. But to call it "ineffable" seems, to me at least, equivalent to saying, that all positive affirmations on the subject are without understanding "what they say or whereof they affirm."

But, in truth, if our Lord meant what his words literally express, his body given, and his blood shed, for us; all speculations and distinctions as to modes of presence are out of place

⁸⁰ "Cavendum est enim, ne ita Divinitatem astruamus, ut veritatem corporis auferamus."—Augustin, Ep. ed Dardan, iii. 10; Migne, ii. 835.

"Quam sit impium et sacrilegum ea, quæ sunt propria carnis Christi, ad naturæ Verbi proprietatem referre, et quæ sunt propria Verbi, proprietati naturæ carnis ascribere."—Vigilius, cited by Ridley, p. 178.

"We must beware lest we so speak of his Divinity, as to take away the truth of his body."—

"What an impious and sacrilegious thing it is, to refer those things to the property of the Word which are the property of the flesh of Christ, and to ascribe those things which are proper to the Word to the property of the nature of the flesh!"

The Bishop also says, that "they which say that Christ is carnally present in the Eucharist, do take from Him the verity of man's nature."—P. 275.

in the doctrine of the Eucharist: for since, by the strictly literal interpretation, by the natural and plain signification of the words, this was his meaning; and since his body is not now in the condition signified by the word "given," and his blood is not now in the condition signified by the word "shed;" since his body given and his blood shed are now no more in the world: there can be but the one only mode of presence of that body,—and—of that blood, which has been before stated; namely, that they are made present to the soul through faith, by that bread which is his body given, and that cup which is his blood shed.

And this, evidently, is the "way and manner" of presence which these three bishops believed: for they believed the flesh, the body and blood, not the body only, but the body—and—blood, of Christ to be "in the sacrament:" and this, not "really," in the sense of "carnally," or "corporally;" but "by virtue and grace only;" not "communicated—to the bread and wine," or "transferred into" them; but "given" "to them which worthily do receive them." The true body of Christ, they affirmed, is really "in heaven," and therefore "cannot be on the earth also;" "absent from earth, and verily present in heaven." But they held that "the bread—is now made a lively presentation of Christ's body, and not only a figure, but effectuously representeth his body."

And such a presence they called "a true presence," because it was "not only a figure:" because the bread is Christ's body and the communion of it. And under protest against the Roman doctrine, and in the sense of a true presence, it was, that Bishops Ridley and Montagu called it a real presence.

But a true presence is another thing from "The Real Presence," properly so called. For as the body of our Lord is a true body: it was a true body which was given, and it was true blood which was shed; and they were truly given and truly shed; and we receive truly that true body and blood: so that true body and blood are truly present to and in the soul which truly remembers Him. All indeed is real, as real as the body and blood which were given and shed at the first, and as the soul which now receives them. But for this Christ is not brought down from above. Faith carries the soul back to the sacrifice, and enables it to feast on it with a present reality, which the Real Presence of the glorified body would overpower and annihilate. The humility and agony of the sacrifice of the body given and the blood shed would be utterly lost in the glory

of the Son of God. While "The Real Objective Presence" takes away the truth of his body; denies that it is a human body by making it "the Body of God," with the powers of the Divinity, instead of the faculties of the humanity: and, substituting that which is for that which was, extinguishes faith, or thrusts mere rationalism into its chair.

But now returning to the Catena before us, we come to

RICHARD HOOKER,

commonly called "the judicious." And well-named is he: but still, be it remembered, not infallible; not always in all things to be accepted with implicit assent. But his name is a tower of strength. Doctor Pusey cites some passages from him, of which the following are extracts: for I think it needless to transcribe more than bears clearly upon the present question. Hooker says that the Apostles

"Were warranted by His promise that not only unto them at the present time, but to whomsoever they and their successors after them did duly administer the same, those mysteries should serve as conducts of life and conveyances of His Body and Blood unto them:"

And he asks:—

"Was it possible they should hear that voice, 'Take, eat, this is my Body; drink ye all of this, this is my Blood;' possible that doing what was required and believing what was promised, the same should have present effect in them, and not fill them with a kind of fearful admiration at the heaven which they saw in themselves?"

"If we doubt what those admirable words may import, let him be our teacher for the meaning of Christ, to whom Christ Himself was a school-master, let our Lord's Apostle be His interpreter, content we ourselves with his explication, My Body, *the Communion of my Body*, My Blood, *the Communion of my Blood*. Is there any thing more expedite, clear, and easy, than that as Christ is termed our Life because through Him we obtain life; so the parts of this sacrament are His Body and Blood, for that they are so to us who receiving them, receive that by them which they are termed? The Bread and Cup are His Body and Blood, because they are causes instrumental, upon the receipt whereof the *participation* of His Body and Blood ensueth. For that which produceth any certain effect, is not vainly or improperly said to be that very effect whereunto it tendeth. Every cause is in the effect which groweth from it. Our souls and bodies quickened to eternal life are effects, the cause whereof is the Person of Christ, His Body and Blood are the true well spring, out of which this life floweth. So that His Body and Blood are in that very subject whereunto they minister life, not only by effect or operation, even as the influence of the heavens is in plants, beasts, men, and in every

thing which they quicken, but also by a far more divine and mystical kind of union, which maketh us one with Him, even as He and the Father are one."

So the passage ends in Doctor Pusey's Catena: and I suppose that some unskilled transcriber, upon whom the selection of confirmatory passages devolved, but with insufficient instruction as to that which they were to confirm, unfortunately thus cut it short. But the fact is, that Hooker goes on immediately in the very next words to say:—

"The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament. And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth, first, 'Take and eat;' then, 'This is my body which was broken for you;' first, 'Drink ye all of this;' then followeth, 'This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ when and where the bread is His body, or the cup His blood; but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them. As for the sacraments, they really exhibit, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really nor do really contain in themselves that grace which with them, or by them, it pleaseth God to bestow."*

A more explicit denial of the doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence" could hardly be expressed: and therefore we pass on to the next authority cited by Doctor Pusey.

BISHOP OVERALL.

Dean Goode † has, indeed, clearly proved that the work from which the extracts here are placed under Overall's name, is not his: but I waive the objection in deference to such as may think that it nevertheless expresses his opinions. On that passage in the consecration prayer of our Liturgy,—"*That we receiving these, Thy creatures of Bread and Wine, &c., may be partakers of his blessed Body and Blood,*" Bishop Overall is alleged to have written:—

"Together with the hallowed elements of the Bread and Wine, we may receive the Body and Blood of Christ, which are truly exhibited in this Sacrament, the one as well as the other."

And on these words misquoted from the Post Communion, "*These holy Mysteries were the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood,*" &c. :—

"Before consecration, we called them God's creatures of Bread and Wine, now we do so no more after consecration; wherein we have the

* V. 67.

† On the Eucharist, ii. 831, &c.

advantage of the Church of Rome, who calls them still creatures in their very mass after consecration ; and yet they will be upbraiding us for denying the Real Presence, whereas we believe better than they : for after consecration we think no more of Bread and Wine, but have our thoughts taken up wholly with the Body of Christ ; and therefore we keep ourselves to these words only, abstaining from the other (though the Bread remain there still, to the eye), which they do not. And herein we follow the Fathers, who after consecration would not suffer it to be called Bread and Wine any longer, but the Body and Blood of Christ."

Again, on the words of the Catechism,—“ *Bread and Wine* ” :—

“ It is confessed by all Divines, that upon the words of the Consecration the Body and Blood of Christ is really and substantially present ; and so exhibited and given to all that receive it, and all this not after a physical and sensual, but after a heavenly and incomprehensible manner.”

And from another work, of the authenticity of which Knox in his “ *Remains* ” is the only witness, these places are given :—

“ In the Sacrament of the Eucharist, or the Lord’s Supper, the Body and Blood of Christ, and therefore the whole of Christ, is verily and indeed present, and is verily partaken by us, and verily combined with the Sacramental signs, as being not only significative, but exhibitory ; so that in the Bread duly given and received, the Body of Christ is given and received ; in the Wine given and received, the Blood of Christ is given and received ; and thus there is a communion of the whole of Christ, in the communion of the Sacrament. Yet not in any bodily, gross, earthly manner, as by transubstantiation, or consubstantiation, or any like devices of human reason, but in a mystical, heavenly, and spiritual manner, as is rightly laid down in our Articles.”

Yet the Bishop is alleged to have written on those words of the Catechism,—“ *What is the inward part or thing signified ?* ”—

“ I cannot see where any real difference is betwixt us about the Real Presence, if we would give over the study of contradiction, and understand one another aright.”

To this must be added from Dean Goode’s extracts,* this :—

“ In the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the body and blood of Christ, and thus whole Christ, is applied to those who receive worthily, not by the way of transubstantiation, nor by the way of consubstantiation, but by the Holy Spirit working through faith.”

Bishop Overall, then, said, or is alleged to have said, that he could “ not see where any real difference ” was “ about the Real Presence ” as held by Romanists and by himself, if contradictions were avoided: that he believed “ better than

* II. 829, 830.

they" about it; because, with the Fathers, he called the bread and wine not by their own names, but the Body and Blood of Christ: that "the body and blood of Christ is really and substantially present," "is verily and indeed present," "is verily combined with the Sacramental signs," and "so exhibited and given," that "together with the hallowed elements of bread and wine," "in the bread duly given and received, the body of Christ is given and received; and in the wine given and received, the blood of Christ is given and received:" and thus "his body and blood is verily partaken by us:" but that this combination "with the Sacramental signs," and participation, is "not after a physical and sensual manner," "in any bodily, gross, earthly manner, as by transubstantiation, or consubstantiation, or any like devices of human reason, but in a mystical, heavenly, spiritual manner," "after a heavenly, and incomprehensible manner." And on this synopsis of Bishop Overall's doctrine, if it be his doctrine, it may be briefly observed, that it is a presence "in the Sacrament," which he acknowledged, and not such a presence in or under or with the elements, or their forms, "as by transubstantiation, consubstantiation, or any like devices of human reason." He called the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ: and believed that the two parts of the Sacrament are so combined together, that "in the bread duly given and received, and in the wine so given and received, the Body and Blood of Christ is given and received also, "in a heavenly, spiritual, and incomprehensible manner,—by—the Holy Spirit working through faith."

Although, therefore, Bishop Overall is thus alleged to have accepted the use of the term "Real Presence," it is clear that he did not use it to denote a presence of our Lord's glorified body in or under the forms of bread and wine. He did not conceive that his body and blood were together in each species: but that the body was given in or combined with the bread—duly received; and the blood in the wine—duly received.

BISHOP MORTON.

"The question is not absolutely concerning a Real Presence, which Protestants (as their own Jesuits witness) do also profess. . . . Which acknowledgment of our adversaries may serve to stay the contrary clamour, and calumnious accusations, wherein they use to range Protestants, with those heretics who denied that the true Body of Christ was in the Eucharist, and maintained only a figure and image of Christ's body,

seeing that our difference is not about the truth or reality of presence, but about the true manner of the being and receiving thereof."

Of the use of the term "Real Presence," by Bishop Morton as expressive of his own doctrine, this passage is alone a sufficient proof: but it is at the same time to be gathered from it, that his doctrine was not that of the Romanists: for he said in another place of the same work:—

"Protestants do teach (as their Cardinal Bellarmine truly witnesseth), that in these words of institution [*this is my bodie,*] the bread is called Christ's bodie, figuratively, as being a sign or figure of Christ's bodie, yet such a figure as doth truly convey unto us the thing signified thereby, for the which truth's sake Christ said not, This bread is a figure of my bodie, but it is my bodie: wherein we see two things plainly professed by all Protestants, first that the words of this Sacrament are not to be expounded according to their literall and proper sence; secondly, that the matter of this Sacrament is the very bodie and blood of our Lord truly offered and exhibited unto us." *

Bishop Morton, then, disallowed the "literall and proper sence" of the words of institution: but held "that the true bodie of Christ is in the Eucharist," and acknowledged "the truth or reality of presence," while he differed from the Romanists "about the true manner of the being and receiving thereof."

Now what he meant by "the truth or reality of presence," is to be seen from another work in these words:—

"There may be observed Foure kinds of *Truths* of Christ his presence in this Sacrament: one is *Veritas Signi*, that is, Truth of *Representation* of Christ his Body; the next is *Veritas Revelationis*, Truth of *Revelation*; the third is *Veritas Obsignationis*, that is, a Truth of *Seale*, for better assurance; the last is *Veritas Exhibitionis*, the truth of *Exhibiting* and deliverance of the Reall Body of Christ to the faithful *Communicants*. The truth of the *Signe*, in respect of the thing signified, is to be acknowledged so farre, as in the *Signes of Bread and Wine* is represented the true and Reall body and blood of Christ."

And some lines after, he cites Theodoret for witness, that—

"*It is a true signe* of the true and Reall Body of Christ." †

And in another place, he says, speaking of the comment of St. Augustine on John vi. 62:—

"You may plainly discern the argument of *Saint Augustine* to be, that Christ by his *Bodily Ascension* would shew to the world, that hee being *Bodily absent* from the Earth, his Flesh could not be here Eaten by *Bodily Tearing* asunder. Thus hee against the *Capernaites*, which must

* The Lord's Supper, 1652, 212, 213, IV. i. 2. † Ibid. 332.

as necessarily confute the Romanists *Corporall Eating* his Flesh, whether it be by *Chewing*, or *Swallowing*; whether *Visibly* or *Invisibly* it mattereth not, because it being the same *Body* that *ascended*, were it *Visibly*, or *Invisibly*, it is equally *absent* from Earth." *

Bishop Morton, therefore, is not justly cited as a believer in "The Real Objective Presence."

We may appropriately add here, what Bishop Morton says of admitting the real or true presence, but differing as to the manner of the being and receiving:—

"It would be a wonder to us, to heare any of our own profession to be so extremely Indifferent, concerning the different opinions of the *Maner of the Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament*; as to thinke the Romish sect therefore either *Tollerable*, or *Reconciliable*, upon pretence that the question is only *De Modo*, (that is) of the *Maner of Being*, and that Consequently all controversie about this is but vaine *Jangling*. Such an one ought to enter into his second thoughts, to consider the necessity that lyeth upon every Christian to abandon divers *Heresies*, albeit their difference from the Orthodox profession were only *De Modo*.—To omit many others, take one poynard, which wee are sure will pierce into the intrailles of the cause (to wit) the heresy of the Capernautes, in the days of our Saviour Christ: who hearing his Sermon, teaching men to *Eate his flesh*; and conceiving thereby a carnall maner of *Eating*, irreconcilably, contrary to the spirituall maner, which was beleevd by the true Disciples of Christ, departed from Christ, and apostated from the Faith.—And that the Romish maner of eating Christ his body is *Capernaitecall*; her maner of *Sacrifice* sacrilegious; her maner of *Divine Adoration* thereof Idolatrous, and all these maners irreconciliable to the maner of our Church, is copiously declared in the Books following." †

BISHOP ANDREWES.

"The Cardinal is not, unless 'willingly ignorant,' that Christ hath said, 'This is my Body,' not 'This is my body *in this mode*.' Now about the object we are both agreed; all the controversy is about the *mode*. The 'This is,' we firmly believe; that it is in this mode (the Bread, namely, being transubstantiated into the Body), or of the mode whereby it is wrought that 'it is,' whether *in*, or *with*, or *under*, or *transubstantiated*, there is not a word in the Gospel.—The Presence, I say, we believe, and that no less true than yourselves. Of the mode of the Presence, we define nothing."—"Now 'the Bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the Body, of the Flesh, of Jesus Christ?' It is surely, and by it, and by nothing more are we made partakers of this blessed union."—"The holy Eucharist, the flesh wherein our Redeemer was seen and suffered, and paid the price of our redemption." "I add, *ubi Christus*; for *ubi Corpus, ubi Sanguis, ibi Christus*, I am sure. And truly here, if there be an *ubi Christus*, there it is. On earth we are never so near Him, nor He us, as

* V. iii. 2.

† Ibid. 210, 211, IV. i. 1.

then and there. There *in efficacit*, and when all is done, efficacy, that is it must do us good, must raise us here, and raise us at the last day to the right hand; and the local *ubi* without it of no value."

"In Christ this sign is a sign, not betokening only, but exhibiting also what it betokeneth, as Sacraments do. For of signs, some shew only and work nothing; such was that of Jonas in itself, *sed ecce plus quam Jonas hic*. For some others there be that shew and work both—work what they shew, present us with what they represent, what they set before us, set or graft in us. Such is that of Christ. For besides that it sets before us of His, it is further a seal or pledge to us of our own, that what we see in Him this day, shall be accomplished in our own selves, at His good time."—"The Bread which we break is the partaking of Christ's true 'Body'—and not of a sign, figure, or remembrance of it. For the Church hath ever believed a true fruition of the true Body of Christ in that Sacrament."

Thus Bishop Andrewes believed a presence "no less than" the Romanists; but he did not believe the mode of presence which they believe. He did "piously believe" the "This is," and that "The bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ." He believed the bread and wine to be that which our Lord called them: to be his body and his blood "*in efficacit*, efficacy;" for that they are a sign, "not betokening only, but exhibiting also what it betokeneth," and "presents us with what it represents:" so that "by it, and by nothing more, are we made partakers of" the flesh of Christ. And thus we have "a true fruition of the true body of Christ in the Sacrament."

But he does not, in the extracts offered to us, so much as name "The Real Presence," neither is there a word of our Lord's presence in or under or with the bread and wine, or their forms. He in fact rejected these as modes which he cared not to define or determine. But we know his opinion from another place cited before in this work, that "if an Host could be turned into Him now glorified as He is, it would not serve; Christ offered is it. Thither we must look; to the Serpent lift up; thither we must repair; even *ad cadaver*."

Here again, nothing is to be found of the doctrine of "The Real Presence" of the glorified body of Christ in, with, or under, the bread and wine, or their forms.

DR. DONNE.

"And therefore *cum non dubitavit Dominus dicere 'Hoc est Corpus Meum,' cum signum daret corporis*, since Christ forbore not to say, 'This is my Body,' when He gave the sign of His Body, why should we forbear to say of that bread, This is Christ's Body, which is the Sacrament of His Body?"

So neither does this witness give any proof of the doctrine he is called to establish.

JACKSON.

“The implication contained in the connection between these two verses (Jno. vi. 63, 62) and the precedent is this; That Christ’s virtual presence, or the influence of life, which His human nature was to distil from His heavenly throne, should be more profitable to such as were capable of it, than His bodily presence; than the bodily eating of His Flesh and Blood could be, although it had been convertible into their bodily substance. This distillation of life and immortality from His glorified human nature is that, which the ancient and orthodoxal Church did mean in their figurative and lofty speeches of Christ’s real Presence, or of eating His very Flesh, and drinking His very Blood in the Sacrament. And the Sacramental Bread is called His Body, and the Sacramental Wine His Blood; as for other reasons, so especially for this, that the virtue or influence of His bloody sacrifice is most plentifully and most effectually distilled from Heaven unto the worthy receivers of the Eucharist.” “All that are partakers of this Sacrament, eat Christ’s Body and drink His Blood sacramentally: that is, they eat that bread which sacramentally is His Body, and drink that Cup which sacramentally is His Blood, whether they eat or drink faithfully or unfaithfully. *For all the Israelites* (1 Cor. x.) *drank of the same spiritual rock, which was Christ sacramentally; all of them were partakers of His presence, when Moses smote the rock.* Yet, ‘with many of them, God was not well pleased,’ because they did not faithfully either drink or participate of His presence. And more displeased He is with such as eat Christ’s body and drink His blood unworthily, though they eat and drink them sacramentally: for eating and drinking so only, that is, without faith, or due respect, they eat and drink to their own condemnation, because they do not discern, or rightly esteem, Christ’s Body or Presence in the Holy Sacrament.

“May we say then, that Christ is really present in the Sacrament, as well to the unworthy as to the faithful receivers? Yes. this we must grant, yet must we add withal, that He is really present with them in a quite contrary manner; really present He is, because virtually present to both; because the operation or efficacy of His Body and Blood is not metaphorical but real in both. Thus the bodily sun, though locally distant from its substance, is really present by its heat and light, as well to sore eyes as to clear sights, but really present to both, by a contrary real operation; and by the like contrary operation, it is really present to clay and to wax, it really hardeneth the one, and really softeneth the other. So doth Christ’s Body and Blood, by its invisible, but real influence, mollify the hearts of such as come to the Sacrament with due preparation, but hardens such as unworthily receive the consecrated elements.”—“Now when we say that Christ is really present in the Sacrament, our meaning is, that as God He is present in an extraordinary manner, after such a manner as He was present (before His incarnation)

in His Sanctuary, the Ark of His Covenant; and by the power of His Godhead thus extraordinarily present, He diffuseth the virtue or operation of His human nature, either to the vivification or hardening of their hearts, who receive the Sacramental pledges."

It would appear from passages not cited by Doctor Pusey, that Dean Jackson used the term "Real Presence."

"If we receive unworthily," he said, "we gain no degree of real union with Him, which is the sole use or fruit of His real presence. Christ might be locally present as He was with many here on earth, and yet not really present. But with whomsoever He is virtually present, that is, to whomsoever He communicates the influence of His Body and Blood by His Spirit, He is really present with them, though locally absent from them. Thus He was really present with the woman, which was cured of her bloody issue, by touching the hem of His garment. But not so really present with the multitude that did throng and press upon Him, that were locally more present with Him."

"What need then is there of His Bodily presence in the Sacrament, or of any other presence than the influence or emission of virtue from His heavenly Sanctuary into our souls? He hath left us the consecrated elements of bread and wine, to be unto us more than the hem of His garment. If we do but touch and taste them with the same faith by which this woman touched the hem of His garment, this our faith shall make us whole."*

But the real presence which he admits, he describes in such a manner that if Doctor Pusey had not included him amongst his authorities, one would have thought it impossible to be mistaken for "The Real Objective Presence." He expressly calls it a "virtual presence," an "influence," or "distillation of life and immortality from our Lord's glorified human nature;" a presence, too, as God, diffusing "the virtue or operation of His human nature," and "more profitable than His bodily presence." For, as he also declares his thought, "Christ might be locally present,—and yet not really present:" and that we have no need "of any other presence than the influence or emission of virtue from His heavenly Sanctuary into our souls," since we touch Him by faith, and are made whole.

SUTTON.

"The faithful receive the blessed Sacrament. Well, what do they receive? Certainly Christ Jesus, truly and really; to make further scruple is needless curiosity; to give light credence hereunto, is in part incredulity. What the elements of Bread and Wine are in themselves,

* Works, 1673, 307, III. x. 55.

is one thing; that they are, being now consecrated to so holy a use, and received of the spiritually minded as the spiritual food of their souls, is another. What they are, I say, Christ's own words are sufficient warrant for a believing world unto the world's end."—" *Rerum absentium* (saith an ancient Father) *præsens est fides; rerum impossibilium, possibilis est fides*; of things absent, faith is present; of things impossible, faith is possible. *Panem vides, verbum audis; cui potius credis? Sensui vel Christo?* Thou seest the bread, thou hearest the word; to which rather dost thou give credit, whether to thy sense, or to Christ?"—"Whereas bread and wine are elements naturally ordained for the sustenance of the body, by the power of Divine benediction they do receive a virtue, that being received of the faithful, they become nourishment to the soul, nay, they become means whereby we are sanctified both in body and soul, and are made the members of Christ."—"He is honoured in this mystery, that was once offered upon the Cross. Yea, but how can this be, that Christ sitting at the right hand of God in heaven, should dispose of His Body to us poor inhabitants of the earth? Take here the answer of the angel Gabriel, the Holy Ghost hath overshadowed it." "Albeit, then, the manner be not of us over anxiously inquired or searched after, yet the same presence of Christ is acknowledged which Christ Himself would have to be acknowledged. We say with St. Ambrose, that there is not taken from bread the substance thereof, but that there is adjoined the grace of Christ's body after a manner ineffable."

"Unless Thou, Lord, hadst said it, 'This is my Body, this is my Blood,' who could have believed it? Unless Thou hadst said, O Holy Christ, 'Take, eat, drink ye all of this,' who durst have touched it?" "Consider the divine Wisdom of the Son of God, who, respecting our weakness, hath conveyed unto us His Body and Blood after a divine and spiritual manner, under the forms of Bread and Wine."

Dr. Sutton's belief, then, was in the plain meaning of our Lord's "own words," which he regarded as "sufficient warrant for a believing world unto the world's end." He conceived that the bread and wine, "being now consecrated to a holy use," "receive a virtue," and have "the grace of Christ's body adjoined" to them, by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost; and that thus "Christ, sitting at the right hand of God in heaven, disposes of His body to us poor inhabitants of the earth," in a "manner to be not of us over curiously inquired or searched after," but "divine and spiritual," and "ineffable."

And in these places, Doctor Sutton neither uses the term, nor professes the doctrine of "The Real Presence."

BISHOP WHITE.

"The more learned Jesuits themselves acknowledge that Protestants believe the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Holy Eu-

charist; and our Divines deliver their faith concerning the Sacrament in this manner,"

namely, in the words cited from Bishop Bilson.

Bishop White used the term "Real Presence," but is not shown to have professed the doctrine which Doctor Pusey means by it. And if we may take the Bishop as in general agreement with "Protestants" on the subject, he certainly did not profess that doctrine.

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

"As for the Church of England, nothing is more plain than that it believes and teaches the true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist." "His Altar, as the greatest place of God's residence upon earth, (I say the greatest) yea, greater than the pulpit. For there 'tis 'Hoc est corpus meum,' 'This is my Body.' But in the pulpit 'tis at most, 'Hoc est verbum meum,' 'This is my word.' And a greater reverence (no doubt) is due to the Body than to the word of our Lord. And so in relation, answerably to the throne, where His Body is usually present, than to the seat where His word useth to be proclaimed." "All sides agree with the Church of England, that in the most blessed Sacrament the worthy receiver is by his faith made spiritually partaker of the true and real Body and Blood of Christ, truly and really, [and of all the benefits of his passion.]* I would have no man troubled at the words truly and really, [for that blessed Sacrament, received as it ought to be, doth 'truly and really' exhibit and apply the body and the blood of Christ to the receiver.]" † "Bellarmine [—] saith, 'Protestants do often grant, that the true and real body of Christ is in the Eucharist,' and it is most true. [—] For the Calvinists, at least they which follow Calvin himself, do not only believe that the true and real Body of Christ is received in the Eucharist, but that it is there; and that we partake of it *vere et realiter*; [—] Nor can that place by any art be shifted, or by any violence wrested from Calvin's true meaning of the Presence of Christ, in and at the blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist [to any supper in heaven whatsoever.] [—] And for the Church of England, nothing is more plain than that it believes and teaches the true and real Presence of Christ, in the Eucharist; unless A.C. can make a body no body, and blood no blood [—as perhaps he can by transubstantiation,—as well as bread no bread and wine no wine. And the Church of England is Protestant too. So Protestants of all sorts maintain a true and real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.—As for the learned of those zealous men that died in this cause in Queen Mary's days, they denied not the real presence simply taken, but as their opposites forced transubstantiation upon them, as if

* I must add in brackets much which has been left out in the Catena, which here in about half a page, gives in apparently one continuous extract passages scattered through ten pages of the original.

† This passage is in Note S, Laud's Conference with Fisher, Works, ii. 321.

that and the real presence had been all one.—Nay, Archbishop Cranmer comes more plainly and more home to it, than Frith; ‘For if you understand,’ saith he, ‘by this word “really,” *re ipsa*, that is, in very deed and effectually; so Christ, by the grace and efficacy of His passion, is indeed and truly present [to all His true and Holy members] (sic). But if you understand by this word “really,” *corporaliter*, “corporally,” in His natural and organical Body, under the forms of bread and wine it is contrary to the holy word of God.’—] Nay, Bishop Ridley adds yet further, [—] ‘That in the Sacrament is the very true and natural Body and Blood of Christ, [even] that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into heaven, which sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead [; only we differ *in modo*, ‘in the way and manner of being,’ we confess all one thing to be in the Sacrament [indeed] (sic) by spirit and grace, &c. You make a grosser kind of being, enclosing a natural, [a lively, and a moving] (sic) Body under the form of bread and wine.’] “My words only imply, that Christ’s body is truly and really in the Sacrament; yet not corporally, but in a spiritual manner, and so is received by us.”

To these places, cited by Dr. Pusey, I have to add the following:—

“They say, ‘the corporal presence of Christ’s body in the Sacrament,’ is to be found in this Service-book. But they must pardon me: I know it is not there. I cannot be myself of a contrary judgment, and yet suffer that to pass.”—“The words it seems are these: ‘O merciful Father, of Thy Almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with Thy word, and Holy Spirit, these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son.’ Well, if these be the words, how will they squeeze corporal presence out of them? Why, first, the change here is made a work of God’s omnipotency. Well, and a work of omnipotency it is, whatever the change be. For less than Omnipotence cannot change these elements, either in nature or use, to so high a service as they are put in that great Sacrament. And therefore the invoking of God’s Almighty goodness, to effect this by them, is no proof at all of intending the ‘corporal presence of Christ in this Sacrament.’—“For if it be only *ut fiant nobis*, that they may be to us the Body and the Blood of Christ; it implies clearly, that they ‘are to us,’ but are not transubstantiated in themselves, into the Body and Blood of Christ, nor that there is any corporal presence in, or under the elements. And then, nothing can more cross the doctrine of the present Church of Rome, than their own service. For as the elements after the benediction, or consecration, are, and may be called, the Body and Blood of Christ, without any addition, in that real and true sense in which they are so called in Scripture; so, when they are said to become the Body and Blood of Christ, *nobis*, to us that communicate as we ought; there is by this addition, *fiant nobis*, an allay in the proper signification of the body and blood; and the true sense, so

well signified and expressed, that the words cannot well be understood otherwise, than to imply not the corporal substance, but the real, and yet the spiritual use of them. And so the words *ut fiant nobis*, import quite contrary to that which they are brought to prove." "Many weak collections and inferences are made by these men out of this part of the Communion of the bodily presence of Christ, but not one evidence is, or can be showed.—'Tis well known, I have maintained the contrary, and perhaps as strongly as any my opposites, and upon grounds more agreeable to the doctrine of the primitive Church." *

I have made the longer extracts from Archbishop Laud, because his memory has been injured, I think, by friends as well as by enemies, from their both imputing to him doctrines which he in fact did not hold. On the present subject, I think he is especially wronged, as if he had been a maintainer of the doctrine of "The Real Presence," in the Roman or Tractarian sense. Whereas I do not find that he used this term, but I find that he did use one which he would have said was most distinctly and essentially different, "The true and real presence," which, of itself, seems to intimate his opinion, that a real presence was professed which is not "true." The presence he believed was true as well as real. And as to the doctrine properly expressed by the term "Real Presence," that is, that our Lord's glorified body is really present in, with, or under, the consecrated bread and wine, or under their forms, Archbishop Laud most clearly did not hold it.

He believed "that Christ's body is truly and really in the Sacrament; yet not corporeally, but in a spiritual manner, and so is received by us": that "the elements after the benediction, or consecration, are, and may be called, the body and blood of Christ, without any addition, in that true and real sense in which they are so called in Scripture:" that they are, or have "become the body and blood of Christ, to us:" that there is, "a true and real presence," "by spirit and grace," of "the true and real body and blood of Christ," which "the Sacrament doth truly and really exhibit and apply to the receiver," who "by faith" is "made" "spiritually partaker of the true and real body and blood of Christ, truly and really, and of all the benefits of His passion." He denied that "there is any corporal presence in, or under the elements." He denied the presence of "the corporal substance" of our Lord's body in them. He acknowledged no "bodily presence of Christ" in the Eucharist. With Arch-

* History of the Troubles and Trials of Archbishop Laud. Works, Oxford, 1853, iii. 353-355, 357.

bishop Cranmer he denied that our Lord is present, "corporally, in his natural and organised body, under the forms of bread and wine." And with Bishop Ridley, he rejected the notion of "a natural, a lively, and a moving body under the form of bread and wine."

If then, our Lord's body has a "corporeal substance," that is to say, if it be a body, if it be his "natural" body; if it be "a lively and a moving body;" if it be an "organical body," that is to say, if it be a human body; Archbishop Laud, not only did not hold, but denied the real presence of it, in or under the forms of the bread and wine. But this is what the doctrine of "The Real Presence" asserts; and therefore this witness, again, does not prove the case for which he is called.

But before we take leave of the Archbishop, it will be well to note what he says about the agreement of all Protestants in a doctrine of a true and real presence. He says:—

"Whereas he [A. C.] imposes upon the Protestants the 'denial or doubting of the true or real presence of Christ in the Eucharist,' he is a great deal more bold than true in that also. For, understand them right, and they certainly neither deny nor doubt it; for, as for the Lutherans, as they are commonly called, their very opinion of consubstantiation makes it known to the world, that they neither deny nor doubt of His true and real presence there. And they are Protestants. And for the Calvinists, if they might be rightly understood, they also maintain a most true and real presence, though they cannot permit their judgment to be transubstantiated. And they are Protestants too, and this is so known a truth that Bellarmine confesses it; for he saith, 'Protestants do often grant, that the true and real body is in the Eucharist;' but he adds, 'That they never say, so far as he hath read, that it is there truly and really, unless they speak of the supper which shall be in heaven.' Well, first, if they grant that the true and real body of Christ is in that Blessed Sacrament, as Bellarmine confesses they do, and it is most true, then A. C. is false, who charges all the Protestants with denial or doubtfulness in this point. And, secondly, Bellarmine also shows here his ignorance or his malice—ignorance, if he knew it not; malice, if he would not know it.—And for the Church of England, nothing is more plain, than that it believes and teaches the true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist;—unless A. C. can make a Body no Body, and Blood no Blood—as perhaps he can by transubstantiation,—as well as bread no bread, and wine no wine. And the Church of England is Protestant too. So Protestants of all sorts maintain a true and real presence in the Eucharist." *

* Conference with Fisher, sect. 35. Vol. ii. 327, 328.

In another place we may consider this doctrine of a true and real Presence : but we have now to pass on to

BISHOP FORBES.

“The doctrine of those Protestants and others seems most safe and true, who are of opinion, nay most firmly believe, that the Body and Blood of Christ is truly, really, and substantially present in the Eucharist, and received [present and taken in the Eucharist but] in a manner incomprehensible in respect of [to] human reason, and [much more] ineffable, known to God alone, and not revealed to us in the Scriptures, [in a way] not corporal, [and by oral sumption] yet neither [even] in the mind alone, or [and] through [by] faith alone, but in another way, known, as was said, to God alone, and to be left to His Omnipotence.”

I have supplied omissions or corrections in brackets, one of which is evidently important ; the Catena having omitted “and by oral sumption.”

Now, waving the fact that Bishop Forbes was not of the Church of England, I shall add this also from his work : “Those err most gravely, by whom it is urged that Christ is not really in the Eucharist, upon these trivial reasonings ; ‘Christ is in heaven, circumscribed in place, &c., therefore He is not in very deed or really in the Eucharist.’ For no one of sound mind thinks, that Christ visibly or invisibly descends from heaven, or from the right hand of the Father, in order ‘to be locally present in the Supper or in the symbols ;’ all the faithful, with unanimous consent and with one voice, profess that they firmly retain as articles of faith, ‘He ascended into heaven, He sitteth at the right hand of the Father,’ and that they believe that the mode of this presence is not natural, corporal, carnal, local by itself, but without any departure from the heavens, and supernatural.”*

Bishop Forbes, then, with Protestants, professed “that the body and blood of Christ is truly, really, and substantially present in the Eucharist,” in “a manner,” which, though “incomprehensible to human reason,” is “not corporal,” nor received “by oral sumption.” And he held that our Lord does not “descend—invisibly from heaven or the right hand of the Father, in order to be present in the Supper or in the symbols :” and that the manner of his presence is neither “natural, corporal, carnal, nor local of itself :” but consistent with being

* *Considerationes Modestæ*, Lib. Angl. Cath. Theology, ii. 422 ; De Euch. I. i. 28.

and remaining in heaven. The Bishop speaks nothing to lead one to suppose that he acknowledged a presence in the elements. He acknowledged a presence "in the Eucharist:" and his words disavowing the notion of our Lord coming down from heaven "in order to be present in the Supper, or—in the symbols," plainly show that he thought it one thing to be present in the Eucharist, and another to be present in the symbols. And the presence he acknowledged was such as is not partaken of "by oral sumption."

The doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence," therefore, has no suffrage from Bishop Forbes.

MEDE.

"The all-wise God, who knew our weakness, hath so ordained in the mystery of this Holy Sacrament, that it is a mystical Incarnation of Christ into every one who receives it. Whence Gregory Nazianzen defines the Eucharist, *κοινωνία ἐνσαρκώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ*, a *Communion of the Incarnation of God*. For in that He affirms the Bread to be His Body, and the Wine to be His Blood; by receiving this Body and Blood of Christ, and so changing it into the substance of our body and into our blood by way of nourishment, the Body of Christ becomes our body, and His Blood is made our blood, and we become in a mystical manner flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone."

"Whose heart is not moved against the Jews, when he hears or reads their villanies and violence offered to our Blessed Saviour? But Chrysostom gives us a good take-heed, *Take heed* (saith he) *lest thou be guilty in the like kind, by unworthy receiving of the blessed Sacrament: he that defiles the King's body, and he that tears it, offend both alike; the Jews tore it, thou defilest it.*"

One may, I suppose, conclude from the words "He affirms the Bread to be His body, and the Wine to be His blood," that Mede believed the elements to be what our Lord called them: and so, that his body is defiled by the unworthy receiver. But there is nothing of "The Real Presence" here.

HERBERT.

"God is here prepared and drest,
And the feast
God in whom all dainties are.

—Drink this
Which before ye drink is blood."

Translating this from overstrained poetry into plain prose, I take it to mean, that the feast is the body and blood of Christ,

the body and blood of Him who is God : which again is nothing to the point.

ARCHBISHOP BRAMHALL.

“ Having viewed all your strength with a single eye, I find not one of your arguments that comes home to Transubstantiation, but only to a true Real Presence ; which no genuine son of the Church of England did ever deny, no, nor your adversary himself. Christ said, ‘ This is My Body ; ’ what He said, we do stedfastly believe.” “ They [the primitive Fathers] contented themselves to believe what Christ had said, ‘ This is My Body,’ without presuming on their own heads to determine the manner how it is His Body ; neither weighing their own words so exactly before any controversy was raised, nor expounding the sayings of other men contrary to the analogy of Faith.”—“ A positive belief that the Sacrament is not the Body of Christ,—were to contradict the words of Christ, ‘ This is My Body.’ ” “ Abate us Transubstantiation, and those things which are consequent of their determination of the manner of Presence, and we have no difference with them in this particular. They who are ordained Priests ought to have power to consecrate the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, to make them present [after such manner as they were present at the first institution].”

The brackets include a qualification which I think of importance, though it is omitted in the Catena. Add the following from the Archbishop’s answer to M. de La Milletiere :—

“ It was not for nothing that our Saviour did distinguish His Body from His Blood, not only in the consecration but also in the distribution, of the Sacrament.” “ We dare not give Divine worship unto any creature, no, not to the very Humanity of Christ in the abstract (much less to the Host), but to the *Whole* Person of Christ, God and Man, by reason of the hypostatical union between the Child of the Virgin Mary, and the Eternal Son, ‘ Who is God over all, Blessed for ever : ’ Shew us such an union betwixt the Deity and the Elements, or accidents, and you say something. But you pretend no such things. The highest that you dare go is this ; ‘ as they that adored Christ when He was upon earth, did after a certain kind adore His garments.’ Is this all ? This is ‘ after a certain kind of manner ’ indeed. We have enough. There is no more adoration due to the Sacrament, than to the garments which Christ did wear upon earth.” “ We rest in the words of Christ, ‘ This is my Body.’ ” *

The Archbishop’s then, was a simple faith in the words of Christ, “ This is my body.” This he stedfastly believed, and in these words did he “ rest.” It is necessarily implied that he had like simple faith in the words, “ This is my blood : ” that

* Pp. 20, 21.

he as stedfastly believed and rested in them, as in the other words of the institution. And he declared that “a positive belief that the Sacrament is not the body of Christ,—were to contradict the words of Christ, ‘This is my body.’” In such faith he said the Fathers also “contented themselves.” And as our Lord said these words of the bread, “This is my body;” and these words of the wine, “This is my blood:” and He thus made the bread his body, and the wine his blood; so also he believed was the effect of consecration by the Lord’s ministers: for the Archbishop said in another place: “In the Holy Eucharist, our consecration is but a repetition of that which was done by Christ, and now done by him that consecrateth in the person of Christ; otherwise the Priest could not say, ‘This is my body.’”*

By this consecration at the first, the bread instead of common bread, became, or was made, the body of Christ; and the wine from common wine, became, or was made, the blood of Christ. And to deny this, the Archbishop considered to be a contradiction to the words of Christ. And no less now than at the first, do Priests “consecrate the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ:” by which consecration the bread becoming the body of Christ, and the wine his blood, the body and blood of Christ are made present. The bread which is the body of Christ, and the wine which is the blood of Christ, being present: the body and blood of Christ are present, not to the sight or touch, certainly, but to the soul. And this presence is, not in any of those ways in which men have presumed to define it, but “after such manner as they [the body and the blood] were present at the first institution.” The Archbishop called this “a true real presence.”

But he remarked: “it was not for nothing that our Saviour did distinguish His body from His blood, not only in the consecration, but also in the distribution.” This he said in opposition to the Romish practice of withholding the cup. But it manifests his opinion, that as much was not given by the one kind, by the bread, as by both kinds, the bread and the cup. He could not, therefore, have believed in our Lord’s body and blood together present, his body living and glorified, in or under the bread. He could not have believed in “The Real Objective Presence.” And the presence he acknowledged, and which he called “a true real presence,” was “after such manner as the body and blood of Christ were present at the first

* Consecration of Protestant Bishops Vindicated, I. xi. III. 165.

institution." He did not imagine that another or a higher gift was imparted in the Eucharist now, than "at the first institution." And he allowed no other "manner" of presence now, in, with, or under the bread and wine, or under their forms, than there was, when our Lord Himself in his living, unbroken body, gave his broken body, and his out-poured blood. Nor did he believe "such an union betwixt the Deity and the elements, or accidents" or forms, as would warrant any "adoration—to the Sacrament." And this again necessarily implies a rejection of the doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence:" for if Christ, the living, glorified Christ, Man and God, be really present in, with, or under the elements or their forms, there can be no question with Christians, but that He is to be adored in, with, or under them.

BISHOP COSIN.

"Where is the danger and what doth he fear as long as all they that believe the Gospel own the true nature and the Real and Substantial Presence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament, using that explication of St. Bernard concerning the manner which he himself, for the too great evidence of truth, durst not but admit? And why doth he own that the manner is spiritual not carnal, and then require a carnal presence, as to the manner itself? As for us, we all openly profess with St. Bernard, that the Presence of the Body of Christ is spiritual, and therefore true and real, and with the same St. Bernard and all the ancients, we deny that the Body of Christ is carnally either present or given. The thing we willingly admit, but humbly and religiously forbear to enquire the manner. . . . We confess with the Fathers, that this manner of presence is unaccountable and past finding out, not to be searched and pryed into by reason, but believed by faith. And if it seems impossible that the flesh of Christ should descend and come to be our food through so great a distance, we must remember how much the power of the Holy Spirit exceeds our senses and our apprehensions, and how absurd it would be to undertake to measure His immensity by our weakness and narrow capacity, and so make our faith to conceive and believe what our reason cannot comprehend.

"Yet our faith does not cause or make that Presence, but apprehends it as most truly and really effected by the word of Christ; and the faith whereby we are said to eat the Flesh of Christ, is not that only whereby we believe that He died for our sins (for this faith is required and supposed to precede the sacramental manducations), but more properly that whereby we believe those words of Christ, 'This is My Body.' Which was St. Austin's meaning when he said, 'Why dost thou prepare thy stomach and thy teeth? Believe, and thou hast eaten! For in this mystical eating, by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghost, we do invisibly receive the substance of Christ's Body and Blood, as much as if we should eat and drink both visibly.'"

The reader will perceive five dots nearly in the middle of the first of these two extracts. These dots mark an omission which I think it necessary to supply:—

“We believe a presence and union of Christ with our soul and body, which we know not how to call better than sacramental, that is, effected by eating; that, while we eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine, we eat and drink therewithal the Body and Blood of Christ, not in a corporal manner, but some other way, incomprehensible, known only to God, which we call spiritual; for if with St. Bernard and the Fathers, a man goes no further, we do not find fault with a general explication of the manner, but with the presumption and self-conceitedness of those who boldly and curiously enquire what is a spiritual presence, as presuming that they can understand the manner of acting of God’s Holy Spirit.*

I must add some rather copious extracts in addition to the above, from this important witness; in order more clearly to develope and exhibit his doctrine. I will recite them in the order in which they occur in his work, and afterwards will bring the substance of them together in one concise view.

“Those words which our blessed Saviour used in the institution of the blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, ‘This is MY Body, which is given for you: This is MY Blood, which is shed for you, for the remission of sins,’ are held and acknowledged by the universal Church to be most true and infallible.—We must embrace and hold for an undoubted truth whatever is taught by divine Scripture. And therefore we can as little doubt of what Christ saith, ‘MY Flesh is meat indeed, and MY Blood is drink indeed;’ which, according to St. Paul, are both given to us by the consecrated elements. For he calls the bread ‘the communion of Christ’s Body,’ and the cup ‘the communion of his Blood.’” † “The elements—are solemnly consecrated by the words of Christ, that by them His blessed Body and Blood may be communicated to us.” ‡ “The expression of Christ and the apostle is to be understood in a sacramental and mystic sense:—no gross and carnal presence of the Body and Blood can be maintained by them.” § “Now a sacramental expression doth, without any inconvenience, give to the sign the name of the thing signified. And such is as well the usual way of speaking, as the nature of sacraments, that not only the names, but even the properties and effects of what they represent and exhibit, are given to the outward elements. Hence (as I said before) the bread is as clearly as positively called by the apostle, ‘the communion of the Body of Christ.’” || “The Body and blood of our Saviour are not only fitly represented by the elements, but also by virtue of His institution really offered to all by them, and so eaten by the

* History of Transubstantiation, III. 3, Oxford, 1851, iv. 170.

† Ib. I. i. p. 155.

‡ Ib. ii.

§ Ib. iii. 156.

|| Ib. iv.

faithful mystically and sacramentally; whence it is, that 'He truly is and abides in us, and we in Him.' This is the spiritual (and yet not less true and undoubted than if it were corporal) eating of Christ's Flesh, not indeed simply as it is flesh, without any other respect, (for so it is not given, neither would it profit us,) but as it is crucified, and *given* for the redemption of the world. Neither doth it hinder the truth and substance of the thing, that this eating of Christ's Body is spiritual, and that by it the souls of the faithful, and not their stomachs, are fed by the operation of the Holy Ghost." * "We leave it to the power and wisdom of our Lord, yielding a full and unfeigned assent to His words." †

"None of the Protestant Churches doubt of the real (that is, true and not imaginary) presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the sacrament." ‡ "Christ said, *This is My Body*; the manner only is controverted. We hold by a firm belief that it is the Body of Christ."

"The Protestants believe a spiritual and true presence of Christ in the sacrament. They [the Roman Church] make it [the term *spiritual*] to signify, 'that Christ is not present in the sacrament either after that manner which is natural to corporal things, or that wherein His own Body subsists in heaven, but according to the manner of existence proper to spirits whole and entire, in each part of the host.'—But all this, and much more to the same effect, was never delivered to us either by Holy Scripture or the ancient Fathers. And, if souls or spirits could be present, as here Bellarmine teacheth, yet it would be absurd to say that bodies could be so likewise, it being inconsistent with their nature." §

"The result of all this is, that the Body and Blood of Christ are sacramentally united to the bread and wine, so that Christ is truly given to the faithful.—Now it is said, that the Body and Blood of Christ are joined to the bread and wine, because that in the celebration of the holy Eucharist, the Flesh is given together with the bread, and the Blood together with the wine." ¶

"None of them [the Protestants] denies altogether but that there is a conversion of the bread into the Body (and consequently of the wine into the Blood) of Christ; for they know and acknowledge that in the sacrament, by virtue of the words and blessing of Christ, the condition, use, and office, of the bread is wholly changed; that is, of common and ordinary, it becomes our mystical and sacramental food; whereby, as they affirm and believe, the true Body of Christ is not only shadowed and figured, but also given indeed, and by worthy communicants truly received.—Our ordinary is changed into mystic bread, and thereby designed and appointed to another use, end, and office." ¶

"He did not say that He gave His disciples a fantastic body,—but that very Body which was given for us, without being deprived of that extension and other accidents of human bodies without which it could not have been crucified." **

* V. vi.

† vii. pp. 155, 156.

‡ II. i. 157; ib. v. 159.

§ III. i. p. 169.

¶ v. 171.

¶ IV. i. 172.

** iii. 173.

“Protestants—firmly believing the words of Christ, make the form of this sacrament to consist in the union of the thing signified with the sign, that is, the exhibition of the Body of Christ with the consecrated bread, still remaining bread: by divine appointment these two are made one; and, though the union be not natural, substantial, personal, or local, by their being one within another, yet it is so straight and so true, that in eating the blessed bread, the true Body of Christ is given to us, and the names of the sign and thing signified are reciprocally changed—and both are united in time, though not in place: for the presence of Christ in this mystery is not opposed to distance, but to absence, which only could deprive us of the benefit and fruition of the object.” *

“Because the thing signified is offered and given to us as truly as the sign itself, in this respect we own the union betwixt the Body and Blood of Christ and the elements, whose use and office we hold to be changed from what it was before.—Christ in the consecrated bread ought not—cannot be kept and preserved to be carried about, because He is present only to the communicants.—Differing from those of Rome only in this, that they will have our union with Christ to be corporal, and our eating of Him likewise, and we, on the contrary, maintain it to be indeed as true, but not carnal or natural.—That Christ (as the Papists affirm) should give His Flesh and Blood to be received with the mouth and ground with the teeth, so that not only the most wicked and infidels, but even rats and mice should swallow Him down,—this our words and our hearts do utterly deny.” †

“It is not questioned whether the Body of Christ be absent from the sacrament duly administered according to His institution, which we Protestants neither affirm nor believe; for, it being given and received in the communion, it must needs be that it is present, though in some manner veiled under the sacrament, so that of itself it cannot be seen.—We do not say that our blessed Saviour gave only the figure and sign of His Body, neither do we deny a sacramental union of the Body and Blood of Christ with the sacred bread and wine, so that both are really and substantially received together.” ‡

“The words of institution would plainly make it appear to any man that would prefer truth to wrangling, that it is with the bread that our Lord’s body is given, as His Blood with the wine; for Christ, having taken, blessed, and broken the bread, said, ‘This is My Body;’ and St. Paul, than whom none could better understand the meaning of Christ, explains it thus: ‘The Bread which we break is the communion or communication, of the Body of Christ,’—that whereby His Body is given, and the faithful are made partakers of it.—Certain it is, that the bread is not the Body of Christ, any otherwise than as the cup is the New Testament; and different consequences cannot be drawn from those two not different expressions. Therefore, as the cup cannot be the New Testament but by a sacramental figure, no more can the bread be the Body of Christ, but in the same sense.” §

* IV. iv. 173.

† IV. v.

‡ vi. pp. 174, 175.

§ V. iv. 180.

“True it is, that to the faithful the element becomes a vivifying body, because they are truly partakers of the heavenly bread, the Body of Christ: but to others, who either receive not, or are not believers, to them the bread may be the antitype, but is not, neither doth become the Body of Christ; for without faith Christ is never eaten.”*

“The Fathers—understood no other change, than that which is common to all sacraments, whereby the outward natural part is said to be changed into the inward and divine, only because it represents it truly and efficaciously, and makes all worthy receivers partakers thereof: and because by virtue of the Holy Spirit, and of Christ's holy institution, the elements obtain those divine excellencies and prerogatives which they cannot have of their own nature.”†

“The ancients did not believe—that the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ is so inseparably tied to the accidents of bread and wine, that Christ must needs be present as long as these accidents retain any resemblance of bread and wine, even when they are not put to that use appointed by divine institution.”‡

“Nobody can deny but that the things that are seen are signs and figures, and those that are not seen the Body and Blood of Christ; and that therefore the nature of this mystery is such, that when we receive the bread and wine we also, together with them, receive at the same time the Body and Blood of Christ, which in the celebration of the Eucharist are as truly given as they are represented.”§

“Whereas it is far above philosophy and human reason, that Christ from heaven (where alone He is locally) should reach down to us the divine virtue of His Flesh, so that we are made one Body with Him, therefore it is as necessary as it is reasonable that the Fathers should tell us, that we ought with singleness of heart to believe the Son of God, when He saith, ‘This is My Body.’”||

“True it is, that the Body and Blood of Christ are sacramentally and really (not feignedly) present, when the blessed Bread and Wine are taken by the faithful communicants; and as true is it also, that they are not present, but only when the hallowed elements are so taken.—That Body and Blood is neither sensibly present (nor otherwise at all present, but only to them that are duly prepared to receive them, and in the very act of receiving them and the consecrated elements together, to which they are sacramentally in that act united), the adoration is then and there given to Christ Himself.”¶

Bishop Cosin, then, yielded “a full and unfeigned assent to our Lord's words” “This is my body.” He embraced and held them “for an undoubted truth:” and so also, of necessity, those other words “This is my blood.” But he called the words “a sacramental expression,” which gives to the sign the name of the

* xv. 186.

† VI. i. 201.

‡ ii. 201, 202.

§ v. 203.

|| VI. x. 208.

¶ Notes on the Book of Common Prayer, Second Series; Angl. Cath. Lib. v. 345.

thing signified :” and therefore he said they are “ to be understood in a sacramental and mystical sense :” and that “ as the cup cannot be the New Testament but by a sacramental figure, no more can the bread be the body of Christ but in the same sense.” But the words are truly interpreted by St. Paul, who makes “ the bread which we break and the cup of blessing which we bless,” to be “ the communion of the body and blood of Christ :” and they “ are solemnly consecrated by the words of Christ, that by them, His blessed body and blood may be communicated to us.”

He thought that “ the body and blood of our Saviour are—fitly represented by the elements,” which are “ said to be changed into the inward and divine part, only because they represent it truly and efficaciously :”—that the body and blood of Christ are “ sacramentally united to the bread and wine,” and “ joined to ” them : that this “ union is not natural, substantial, personal, or local,” nor “ by their being one within another :” that they “ are united in time, though not in place :”—that this union “ is so straight and true, that in eating the blessed bread, the true body of Christ is given to us :” that “ the union of the thing signified with the sign is the exhibition of the body of Christ together with the consecrated bread :” “ that in the celebration of the Eucharist, the flesh is given together with the bread, and the blood together with the wine :” “ so that Christ is truly given to the faithful :” that “ the body and blood of our Saviour are—really offered to all by the elements,” and “ are really and substantially received together ” with them, “ the flesh ” being given together with the bread, and “ the blood ” together with the wine ; so “ that when we receive the bread and wine, we also, together with them, receive, at the same time, the body and blood of Christ ;” and “ while we eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine, we eat and drink therewith the body and blood of Christ.”

He says that “ the true body, the very body, of Christ is truly given to us,” “ but as it is crucified, and *given* for the redemption of the world ;” and is “ by worthy communicants truly received ;” “ the body and blood of Christ with the sacred bread and wine, both—really and substantially received together.”

But he believed that “ the body of Christ—being given and received in the communion, it must needs be that it is present ;” yet that Christ “ is present only to the communicants :” that his body is not “ carnally either present or given :” that his presence is not “ gross or carnal ;” nor “ inseparably tied to the accidents of bread and wine, so that He must needs be present

as long as these accidents retain any resemblance of bread and wine:” that it is “spiritual, and therefore true and real;” and neither “imaginary” nor “feigned,” but “substantial.”

Then, again, Bishop Cosin thought that “to those who receive not, or are not believers,—the bread—is not, neither doth become, the body of Christ;” that the body and blood of Christ—are not present, but only when the “hallowed elements are—taken” “by the faithful communicants.”

And, lastly, the Bishop says, that “Christ is locally in heaven alone:” that his presence is not local: that it is in the sacrament, “a presence and union of Him with the soul and body—effected by eating,” inasmuch as “while we eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine, we eat and drink therewith His body and blood, which are present to such communicants only as are duly prepared to receive them, and to them in the very act only of receiving them and the consecrated elements together, to which they are sacramentally in that act united.”

To this may be added the Bishop’s opinion, that, “if souls or spirits could be present” as presence is predicated of our Lord’s body in, with, or under the elements or under their forms, “yet it would be absurd to say that bodies could be so likewise, it being inconsistent with their nature.”*

I believe this to be an impartial view of Bishop Cosin’s doctrine. I cannot say the doctrine is quite consistent with itself: but it is not my business to reconcile it. It will be sufficient here to recommend a careful perusal of the foregoing passages to those who imagine that Bishop Cosin was a believer and maintainer of the Tractarian doctrine of “The Real Presence:” and to enunciate very briefly the conclusion, that the presence he believed, though true and real, because spiritual, was a presence, not in the elements or under them, but in the sacrament, a presence only to the faithful communicant, and to him only in the very act of communion.

BISHOP SPARROW.

“‘The Holy Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper,’ says St. Chrysostom, ‘which the Priest now makes, is the same that Christ gave to His Apostles,’ &c. Again, ‘Christ is present at the Sacrament now, that first instituted it. He consecrates this also: it is not man that makes the Body and Blood of Christ by consecrating the holy elements, but Christ that was crucified for us. The words are pronounced by the words [mouth] of the

* III. i. 169.

Priest, but the elements are consecrated by the power and grace of God. "This is," saith He, "My Body;" by this word the bread and wine are consecrated.'

"When the Priest hath said at the delivery of the Sacrament, The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life, the communicant is to answer, Amen. By this Amen professing his faith of the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in that Sacrament."

Bishop Sparrow was of the same mind with St. Chrysostom, who says, "that Christ is present at the Sacrament," and that consecration "makes the Body and Blood of Christ," by the words, "This is my body." And it was his opinion, that the communicant, in the Church of England, professes "his faith of the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in that Sacrament." But granting this, the presence of Christ "at the Sacrament," and "the Real Presence of his Body and Blood in the Sacrament," does not amount to the Real Presence of Christ, of his glorified body, in, with, or under the bread and wine, or under their forms.

HAMMOND.

"This *breaking, taking, eating of the bread*, this whole action, is the real communication of the Body of Christ to me—the very giving of Christ's body to me; that as verily as I eat the bread in my mouth, so verily God in Heaven bestows on me, communicates to me the body of the crucified Saviour. And so all that I told you of the full sense of that phrase, '*Communication of Christ's Body*,' is again to be repeated here to make up the sense of those words, '*This is my Body*.'"

This was written by Doctor Hammond to "*shew how the phrase, 'This is my body,' in the Gospel, interpreted by this taking and eating is my body, was to be understood.*" But it neither recognises the term of "The Real Presence," nor does it express or imply the doctrine.

The Doctor's opinion can be more clearly understood from these places following:—

"The meaning of Christ's words of institution, '*This is my body*,' &c.," is "not that the bread was His body and the wine His blood, in strict speaking, for He was there in His body, when He so spake; and when the disciples distributed it among themselves, He was not bodily in any of their mouths. And now His body is in heaven, and there to be contained till the day of '*restitution of all things*,' and is not corporally brought down in every Sacrament, either to be joined locally with the elements, or for the elements to be changed into it; many contradictions and barbarisms would be consequent to such an interpretation.—It would make God a liar, and be an argument not of power, but imperfection."

“That the faithful do receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, which implies not any corporal presence of Christ on the table, or in the elements, but God’s communicating the crucified Saviour, who is in heaven bodily, and nowhere else, to us sinners on the earth, but this mystically, and after an ineffable manner.” “And then God’s part is the accepting of this our bounden duty, bestowing that Body and Blood of Christ upon us, not by sending it down locally for our bodies to feed on, but really for our souls to be strengthened and refreshed by it: as when the sun is communicated to us, the whole bulk and body of the sun is not removed out of its sphere, but the rays and beams of it, and with them the light, and warmth, and influences, are really and verily bestowed and darted out upon us. And all this is the full importance of ‘This is my body,’ or this is the communication of His body.”*

BISHOP FELL.

“For this holy ceremony was not instituted by us for eating and drinking, but by the Lord Himself, for a sacred solemn commemoration of His death, and to be approached with all reverence and great preparation, as being the Body and Blood of the Lord.”

It is a pity to have brought forward this very careless piece of writing; which shows more carelessness in the collector even than in the author himself. For in its grammatical construction it asserts, that “this holy ceremony is the Body and Blood of the Lord.” What the meaning may be, it is hardly for me to enquire: though it seems to be that the consecrated elements are the body and blood of Christ. But it contributes nothing to the case.

THORNDIKE.

“If the Church only pray that the Spirit of God, coming down upon the elements, may make them the Body and Blood of Christ, so that they which received them may be filled with the grace of His Spirit; then is it not the sense of the Catholic Church that can oblige any man to retain the abolishing of the elements, in their bodily substance; because, supposing that they remain, they may nevertheless become the instrument of God’s Spirit to convey the operation thereof to them that are disposed to receive it, no otherwise than His Flesh and Blood conveyed efficacy thereof upon the earth. And that I suppose is reason enough, to call it the Body and Blood of Christ sacramentally, that is to say, as in the sacrament of the Eucharist. It is not here to be denied, that all ecclesiastical writers do, with one mouth, bear witness to the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist.—When they speak of the elements, supposing the consecration to have passed upon them, they always call them by the same not of their bodily substance, but of the Body and Blood of Christ which they are become.”†

* Practical Catechism, VI. iv. Anglo-Cath. Library, 382, 385, 393.

† Epilogue III. Laws of the Church, IV. xxii. Anglo-Cath. Library, iv. i. 69.

Here it is to be observed, that Thorndike believed the bread and wine to be made and to "have become," the body and blood of Christ: that therefore "ecclesiastical writers always call them by" this name: and that so calling them they "do with one mouth bear witness to the presence of the body and blood of Christ."

But his doctrine will be better understood from the following places:—

"Shall this evidence of the nature and substance of bread and wine remaining in the sacrament of the Eucharist even when it is a sacrament, that is, when it is received, either deface or efface the evidence, which the same Scriptures yield us, of the truth of Christ's Body and Blood, brought forth and made to be in the sacrament of the Eucharist, by making it to be that sacrament? Surely we must not suffer such a conceit to possess us, unless we will offer the same violence to the manifest and express words of the Scripture."* "Supposing the bread and the wine to remain in the sacrament of the Eucharist, as sense informs and the word of God enforces, if the same word of God affirm these to be also the Flesh and Blood of Christ, what remaineth, but that bread and wine by nature and bodily substance, be also the Bodily Flesh and Blood of Christ by mystical representation—and by spiritual grace? For what reason can be imagined, why the material presence of bread and wine in bodily substance should hinder the mystical and spiritual presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, as in a sacrament, whereby they are tendered of grace to them that receive?"† "It behoves, indeed, that He procure the Flesh and Blood of Christ to be there by the operation of that Spirit, which framed Them for an habitation to Itself in the womb of the Virgin (that the receiving of His Flesh and Blood may be the means of conveying His Spirit): but how is it requisite that They be there in bodily substance, as if the mystical presence of them were not a sufficient means to convey His Spirit, which we see is conveyed by the mere spiritual consideration and resolution of a lively and effectual faith?"‡

"This change [wrought in the elements by the consecration of them into the sacrament] consisting in the assistance of the Holy Ghost, which makes the elements in which It dwells, the Body and Blood of Christ; it is not necessary that we acknowledge the bodily substance of them to be any way abolished."

"Our Lord Jesus Christ instituted this sacrament, with a promise to make by His Spirit the elements of bread and wine sacramentally His Body and Blood; so that His Spirit that made them so (dwelling in them as in His natural Body), should feed them with Christ's Body and Blood that receive the sacrament of Them with living faith."§

"Here is the place for me to allege those Scriptures which inform us of the true nature and properties of the Flesh and Blood of Christ, remaining

* Laws of the Church, II. 8, p. 11.

‡ xxxii. p. 32.

† Ibid. II. xxiii. p. 22.

§ Ibid. III. v. 37.

in His Body even now that It is glorified.—It behoveth us to understand, how we are informed, that the promise of His Body and Blood in the Eucharist imports an exception to so many declarations, before we believe it. Indeed, there is no place of God's right hand, by sitting down at which we may say that our Lord's Body becomes confined to the said place: but seeing the Flesh of Christ is taken up into heaven to sit down at God's right hand, (though, by his sitting down at God's right hand, we understand the Man Christ to be put into the exercise of that Divine power and command which His mediator's office requires,) yet His Body we must understand to be confined to that place, where the Majesty of God appears to those that attend upon His throne." *

"For so are we assured that the elements which the Church consecrates, are the Body and Blood of Christ; as those were whereof our Lord speaks.—What the thanksgiving used in the services, that are extant, was wont to contain, is there to be seen. But it ended in a prayer;—that the Holy Ghost may come down upon the elements proposed, to make them the Body and Blood of Christ." "Is it not change enough, that the elements become the Body and Blood of Christ, which they were not before?"

"Who can deny, that, if the union of the Spirit with the elements continue so long, and to such purposes, as the Church intends by consecrating, the institution of our Lord is made good and His doctrine fully verified?" †

"They, who make good or receive the covenant of their baptism in receiving it [the Eucharist], shall receive the Body and Blood of Christ, and by consequence His Spirit, hypostatically united to the same, to enable them to perform it." ‡

"Now it [the command of Christ] is executed, and hath always been executed, by the act of the Church, upon God's word of institution, praying, that, the Holy Ghost, coming down upon the present elements, 'may make them the Body and Blood of Christ.' Not by changing them into the nature of flesh and blood; as the bread and wine, that nourished our Lord Christ on earth, became the Flesh and Blood of the Son of God by becoming the Flesh and Blood of His manhood, hypostatically united to His Godhead, saith Gregory Nyssen; but immediately and *ipso facto* by being united to the Spirit of Christ, that is, His Godhead. For the Flesh and Blood of Christ by incarnation, the elements by consecration, become both one sacramentally, by being both one with the Spirit or Godhead of Christ, to the conveying of God's Spirit to a Christian." §

Nothing is said in any of these places of "The Real Presence;" nor do I find the term in any of the works of this learned and able writer. He speaks often of the mystical, spiritual, or sacramental presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, but, if I mistake not, he never uses the term "Real Presence," to

* Laws of the Church III. xiv. 47, 48.

† Reformation of the Church of England, XXVI. i. ii. iii. v. V. 545, 546.

‡ Just Weights and Measures, XXI. viii. V. 226.

§ Ibid. XIV. iv. V. 173.

express his doctrine. And different indeed is his doctrine from that to which this term belongs. In brief, as it may be collected from the foregoing extracts it is as follows.

He believed, as he alleged with "the Catholic Church," "that the Spirit of God, coming down upon the elements, makes them the Body and Blood of Christ:" that there is thus "a union of the Spirit, with the elements;" and they become "sacramentally" the body and blood of Christ: that on consecration they are "immediately and *ipso facto*," made the body and blood of Christ, "by being united to the spirit of Christ, that is His Godhead:" that "the flesh and blood of Christ by incarnation," and "the elements by consecration, become both one sacramentally, by being both one with the Godhead of Christ:" that "the truth of Christ's body and blood" is "made to be in the sacrament" of the Eucharist by this consecration: that the bread and wine have become and are "the bodily flesh and blood of Christ:" and that a mystic, spiritual, and sacramental presence of Christ's body and blood is thus effected.

Moreover, he believed, that the Spirit of Christ which made the elements, or changed them into, the body and blood of Christ, "dwelling in them, as in His natural body," feeds "with Christ's body and blood, them that receive the sacrament of them with living faith:" that the union of the Spirit with the elements is for the purpose, that the flesh and blood of Christ "may be the means of conveying His Spirit:" and that consequently the elements do "convey His Spirit," that is, his Godhead.

And for this presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, Thorndike thought it not "requisite, that they be there in bodily substance;" nor, indeed, possible, inasmuch as "the flesh of Christ is taken up into heaven," and "we must understand His body to be confined to that place."

The difference, then, is great between the doctrine of Thorndike, and that which Dr. Pusey holds.

L'ESTRANGE.

"That Real Presence which all sound Protestants seem to allow.—Between the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, and the Sacramental commemoration of His Passion, there is so inseparable a league, as *subsist* they cannot, unless they *consist*. A sacramental verity of Christ's Body and Blood there cannot be, without the Commemoration of His Death and Passion, because Christ never promised His mysterious (yet Real) Presence

but in reference to such Commemoration; nor can there be a true Commemoration without the Body and Blood exhibited and participated; because Christ gave not those visible elements, but His Body and Blood to make that spiritual representation."

"Indeed, if consecration be of any import, if with God it reconcileth anything effectual towards the making those elements the Body and Blood of Christ, if in us it createth any greater reverence to those dreadful mysteries, then certainly that consecration must needs excel all others which is made in the full congregation."

Here a "Real Presence" is allowed: "the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist" is acknowledged; "a sacramental verity of Christ's body and blood:" "the body and blood" are spoken of as "exhibited and participated," that is, truly offered and received: and the "import" of consecration, is declared to be "the making those elements the body and blood of Christ."

It would seem, therefore, to be L'Estrange's doctrine, that the bread is the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the wine is his blood: that they are "a sacramental verity of His body and blood:" and thus, that there is "a mysterious yet real presence of His body and blood." But there is no intimation here of "The Real Presence" of our Lord Himself, or of his glorified body, in the elements, or under their forms. Some statements much beyond those before us, must be produced from this author, to show that he believed in "The Real Presence," as it is now taught.

TAYLOR.

"The doctrine of the Church of England, and generally of the Protestants, in this article, is—that after the Minister of the holy Mysteries hath rightly prayed, and blessed and consecrated the Bread and Wine, the symbols become changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, after a sacramental, that is, in a spiritual real manner: so that all that worthily communicate, do by faith receive Christ really, effectually, to all the purposes of His Passion; the wicked receive not Christ, but the bare symbol only; but yet to their hurt, because the offer of Christ is rejected, and they pollute the Blood of the covenant, by using It as an unholy thing. The result of which doctrine is this: It is bread, and it is Christ's Body. It is bread in substance, Christ in the Sacrament; and Christ is as really given to all that are truly disposed, as the symbols are; each as they can; Christ as Christ can be given; the bread and wine as they can, and to the same real purposes, to which they are designed: and Christ does as really nourish and sanctify the soul, as the elements do the body."

"This may suffice for the word 'real' which the English Papists use, out, as it appears, with much less reason than the sons of the Church of England; and when the Real Presence is denied, the word 'real' is taken

for 'natural,' and does not signify 'transcendent,' or in his just and most proper signification. But the word 'substantialiter' is also used by Protestants in this question, which, I suppose, may be the same with that which is in the Article of Trent, 'sacramentaliter præsens Salvator substantiâ suâ nobis adest,' in substance, but after a sacramental manner, which word if they might be understood in the sense in which the Protestants use them, that is, really, truly, without fiction or the help of fancy, but 'in rei veritate,' so, as Philo calls spiritual things ἀναγκαίωτατα ὀψίαι, 'most necessary, useful, and material substances,' it might become an instrument of a united confession."

"One thing more I am to note in order to the same purposes; that, in the explication of this question, it is much insisted upon, that it be enquired whether we believe Christ's Body to be 'really' in the Sacrament, we mean 'that Body, that Flesh, that was born of the Virgin Mary,' that was crucified, dead, and buried? I answer, I know none else that He had, or hath: there is but one Body of Christ natural and glorified; but he that says, that Body is glorified, which was crucified, says it is the same Body, but not after the same manner: and so it is in the Sacrament; we eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ, that was broken and poured forth; for there is no other body, no other blood, of Christ, but though it is the same which we eat and drink, yet it is in another manner."

"In this Feast all Christ, and Christ's Passion, and all His graces, the blessings and effects of His sufferings, are conveyed."

"Have mercy upon us, O heavenly Father, according to Thy glorious mercies and promises, send Thy Holy Ghost upon our hearts, and let Him descend upon these gifts, that by His good, His holy, His Glorious Presence, He may sanctify and enlighten our hearts, and He may bless and sanctify these gifts, that this Bread may become the Holy Body of Christ, and this chalice may become the life-giving Blood of Christ."

"Dispute not concerning the secret of the mystery, and the nicety of the manner of Christ's Presence; it is sufficient to thee that Christ shall be present to thy soul.

"The Christian ministry, having greater privileges, and being honoured with attraction of the Body and Blood of Christ, and offices serving to a better covenant, may with greater argument be accounted excellent, honourable, and royal."

The sum of these places of Bishop Taylor, is as follows. He believed that the Holy Ghost, the third Person of the Holy Trinity, descends at the prayer of the Church upon the gifts, upon the bread and wine set forth for the Sacrament: that "by His good, holy, and glorious Presence," they "become the Holy body, and the life-giving blood of Christ:" that they are thus "changed into the body and blood of Christ:" that the bread, still remaining bread, "is Christ's body," and, by consequence, that the wine, still remaining wine, is his blood: that this change is "after a sacramental, that is, in a spiritual, real

manner :” that the bread has become and is that “ one body of Christ,” “ that Flesh, that was born of the Virgin Mary,” so that in the sacrament, “ we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, that was broken and poured forth,” that is to say, “ that all that worthily communicate, do receive Christ really, effectually to all the purposes of His passion ;” “ but the wicked receive not Christ, but the bare symbol only :” that they who receive Him, receive Him “ by faith :” and that it is sufficient to know and believe that “ Christ is present to the soul.”

Now that the elements are changed into, have become, and are, the body and blood of Christ, is a very different proposition from that which affirms “ The Real Presence ” of his body and blood, of his glorified body, in them or under their forms. And if Bishop Taylor held that the wicked do not receive Christ, he did not believe in such presence. Moreover, he taught that, putting aside all enquiry as to the manner of Christ’s presence, “ it is sufficient—that Christ shall be present to the soul :” an instruction which he would not have given, if he had been a believer in such a presence as he is brought forward to establish. Indeed, many sayings and arguments might be extracted from his works, which very strongly oppose the Tractarian doctrine. But I will content myself with the two places following.

“ We say, as they said, Christ’s body is truly there, and there is a conversion of the elements into Christ’s body ; for what, before the consecration, in all senses was bread, is, after consecration, in some sense, Christ’s body.”

“ We by the real spiritual presence of Christ do understand Christ to be present as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful by blessing and grace ; and this is all which we mean besides the tropical and figurative presence.”*

BISHOP KEN.

“ I believe, O crucified Lord, that the bread which we break in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries is the communication of Thy Body, and the cup of blessing which we bless is the communication of Thy blood, and that Thou dost as effectually and really convey Thy Body and Blood to our souls by the Bread and Wine, as Thou didst Thy Holy Spirit by Thy breath to Thy disciples.”

“ Lord, what need I labour in vain to search out the manner of Thy

* I am indebted to Dean Goode for a reference to these passages, the former of which is from the “ Dissuasive from Popery,” i. p. 97 ; the latter from the Doctrine of the Real Presence, p. 15.

mysterious Presence in the Sacrament, when my love assures me Thou art there?"

"O God Incarnate, how Thou canst give us Thy flesh to eat and Thy Blood to drink; how Thy flesh is meat indeed; how Thou who art in heaven art present on the Altar, I can by no means explain: but I firmly believe it, because Thou hast said it."

It was the faith, then, of Bishop Ken, that the bread of the Eucharist "is the communication" of our Lord's "body," and the wine "the communication of His blood:" that there is a mysterious presence "of Christ" in the Sacrament, "and that although He is in heaven, He gives us His flesh to eat, and His blood to drink," and that this, "as effectually and really," is conveyed "to our souls" by the bread which we break, and the cup of blessing which we bless, as He conveyed His "Holy Spirit by His breath to His disciples."

But a "mysterious presence" of our Lord "in the Sacrament" may be, without "The Real Presence" of His glorified body in the elements of the Sacrament. And the communication of His flesh to eat, and of His blood to drink, is not stated here to be by His leaving heaven, but while "He is in heaven." The communication spoken of by Bishop Ken, is the conveyance "to our souls" of the "body to eat" and of the "blood to drink."

I cannot but fear that this investigation is tedious to the reader; but neither in justice to my subject, can I release him from pursuing it to the end. He will then see the importance of the investigation; and will yet be astonished that it should ever have been challenged.

BISHOP HACKETT.

"That which astonisheth the communicant and ravisheth his heart is, that this Feast affords no worse meat than the Body and Blood of our Saviour. These He gave for the life of the world, these are the repast of this Supper, and these we truly partake. For there is not only the visible reception of the outward signs, but an invisible reception of the thing signified."

"Christ did not propose a sign at that hour, but also He gave us a Gift, and that Gift really and effectually is Himself, which is all one, as you would say, spiritually Himself; for spiritual union is the most true and real union that can be. That which is promised, and faith takes it, and hath it, is not fiction, fancy, opinion, falsity, but substance and verity.—But faith is the mouth wherewith we eat His Body and drink His Blood, not the mouth of a man, but of a faithful man, for we hunger after Him not with a corporeal appetite but a spiritual, therefore our eating must be

spiritual, and not corporeal. Yet this is a real substantial partaking of Christ crucified, broken, His Flesh bleeding, His wounds gaping: so He is exhibited, so we are sure to receive Him, which doth not only touch our outward senses in the elements, but pass through into the depth of the soul. For in true divinity real and spiritual are equipollent.*

The gift in the Eucharist is here stated to be “really and effectually—Christ Himself;” “Christ spiritually,” “Christ crucified, broken, His flesh bleeding, His wounds gaping: so He is exhibited, and so we are sure to receive Him.” We are truly and really, because spiritually, partakers of His body and blood, in “substance and verity.” And “faith is the mouth wherewith we eat His body and drink His blood, not the mouth of a man, but the mouth of a faithful man.”

If then, it be “Christ crucified and broken” that we receive, it is his dead body, and his blood poured out, not his glorified body, which we receive. And if “faith” be “the mouth wherewith we eat His body and drink His blood;” if it be not “the mouth of a man,” the mouth of the body of a man, “but the mouth of a faithful man” which receives the gift; then it is not in the elements or under their form: there is no “Real Presence” of our Lord’s glorified body in them.

BISHOP BEVERIDGE.

“When we hear the words of consecration repeated as they came from our Lord’s own mouth, ‘This is my Body which is given for you,’ and ‘This is my Blood which was shed for you and for many for the remission of sins;’ we are then stedfastly to believe, that although the substance of the Bread and Wine still remain, yet now it is not common bread and wine, as to its use; but the Body and Blood of Christ in that Sacramental sense wherein He spake the words . . . [insomuch, that whosoever duly receives these, His creatures of bread and wine, according to Christ’s holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, are partakers of His most precious body and blood, as it is expressed in the prayer of consecration.]*

“When it comes to our turn to receive it, then we are to lay aside all thoughts of bread, and wine, and minister, and everything else that is or can be seen, and fix our faith, as it is ‘the evidence of things not seen,’ wholly and solely upon our blessed Saviour, as offering us His own Body and Blood to preserve our bodies and souls to everlasting life, which we are therefore to receive by faith, as it is ‘the substance of things hoped for,’ stedfastly believing it to be, as our Saviour said, ‘His Body and Blood,’ which our Church teacheth us, are ‘verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper,’ [by which means, whatsoever it is to others, it will

* The passage in brackets is omitted in the Catena.

be to us, who receive it with such a faith, the body and blood of Christ our Saviour, the very 'substance of all things hoped for,' upon the account of His body that was broken, and His blood that was shed for us.]*

"He plainly signified that what He now gave them to eat and drink, He would have them look upon it, and receive it, not as common bread and wine, but as His Body and Blood; the one as broken, the other as shed for their sins."

"Our Church requires us to receive the Holy Sacrament kneeling, not out of any respect to the creatures of Bread and Wine, but to put us in mind that Almighty God, our Creator and Redeemer, the only object of all religious worship, is there specially present, offering His own Body and blood to us."

We are to believe, then, that "Almighty God, our Creator and Redeemer—is specially present" in the Eucharist, "offering His own body and blood to us;" His "body as broken, His blood as shed, for our sins:" since the bread is His body, and the wine is His blood, "in that sacramental sense wherein He spake the words," insomuch that they who "duly receive" the creatures of bread and wine "are partakers of His most precious body and blood:" and whatsoever it be to others, to those who communicate with faith, the Sacrament will be "the very substance of all things hoped for," "the body and blood of Christ our Saviour."

One or two more places will more clearly show what Bishop Beveridge's opinion was. He says:—

"It is bread we eat, and wine we drink, in the sacrament, not the real body and blood of Christ." † "The very words of institution themselves are sufficient to convince any rational man, whose reason is not darkened by prejudice, that that of which our Saviour said, *This is my body*, was real bread, and so his body only in a figurative and sacramental sense; and, by consequence, that the bread was not turned into his body, but his body was only represented by the bread." "It being so clear a truth that the bread and wine are not turned into the very body and blood of Christ in the holy sacrament, we need not heap up many arguments to prove that it is only after a spiritual, not after a corporal manner, that the body and blood of Christ are received and eaten in the sacrament. For if the bread be not really changed into the body of Christ, then the body of Christ is not really there present; and if it be not really there present it is impossible it should be really eaten and received into our bodies as bread is." ‡

* The passages in brackets are in Bishop Beveridge's *Necessity and Advantage of Frequent Communion*. Works, Angl. Cath. Lib. viii. 604, 606.

† *Thesaurus Theologicus*, 1 Cor. xi. 26, Angl. Cath. Lib. x. 87.

‡ On the Articles, Art. xxviii. Angl. Cath. Lib. vii. 477, 482, 483.

BISHOP BULL.

“We are not ignorant that the ancient Fathers generally teach that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, by or upon the consecration of them, do become and are made the Body and Blood of Christ.—Some of the most ancient doctors of the Church, as Justin Martyr and Irenæus, seem to have had this notion, that by or upon the sacerdotal Benediction, the Spirit of Christ, or a divine virtue from Christ, descends upon the elements, and accompanies them to all worthy communicants, and that therefore they are said to be and are the Body and Blood of Christ; the same Divinity which is hypostatically united to the Body of Christ in heaven, being virtually united to the elements of Bread and Wine on earth. Which also seems to be the meaning of all the ancient Liturgies, in which it is prayed that God would send down His Spirit upon the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist.”

Bishop Bull is not here expressing his own sentiments; but the teaching of the ancient Fathers, in which we cannot doubt that he concurred. And the teaching of some in particular he speaks of, not assenting to it, but referring to it only as having suffered “from the forced and absurd glosses of the Romanists,” from which they were vindicated by his “learned friend, Mr. Grabe.”*

But that he did not hold the doctrine of “The Real Presence” is manifest from the page before that in which the above-cited passage is to be found:—

“Whatsoever our Saviour said was undoubtedly true; but these words could not be true in a proper sense; for our Saviour’s body was not then given or broken, but whole and inviolate; nor was there one drop of His blood yet shed. The words, therefore, must necessarily be understood in a figurative sense.”*

HICKES.

He cites “Irenæus, St. Polycarp’s contemporary,” saying that—
“The Bread which is from the earth, partaking of the invocation of God, is no longer common bread but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and an heavenly;”

and remarks that—

“In this passage the holy Father does most expressly assert that the Bread is made the Eucharist, that is, the Body of Jesus Christ by invocation of God—to wit, by consecration.”

And he cites the same Father for the words:—

“When—both the Bread broken and the Cup mixed, have partaken of the Word of God, they become the Eucharist of the Body and Blood of Christ.”

* Corruptions of the Church of Rome. Works, Oxford, 1827, ii. 256, 254.

Hickes, no doubt, founded his own opinions expressed in the words of Irenæus: but there is nothing whatever in them for the doctrine of "The Real Presence."

DEAN COMBER.

"[The elements—truly consecrated]—are now to be esteemed as the very Body and Blood of Christ: let us, therefore, here most devoutly seal all that the Priest hath done, and unfeignedly testify our faith by a hearty *Amen*. 'Lord, it is done as Thou hast commanded, and I doubt not but the mystery is rightly accomplished; I am persuaded that here is that which my soul longeth after, a crucified Saviour communicating Himself to poor penitent sinners.'

"Still we do believe that every duly disposed communicant doth receive really the Body and Blood of Christ, in and by these elements; but it is by faith and not by sense. If we receive them in the manner and to the end which Christ appointed, they give us a lively remembrance of His love and all-sufficient merit, and thereby invite our faith to embrace this crucified Redeemer as the satisfaction for our sins; whereupon He (who is most ready to close with penitent sinners) doth by this rite of His own appointing, give Himself and the salutary benefits of His death unto such, and, although the manner be mysterious, yet the advantages are real, and the effect more certain than if we eat or drank His natural flesh and blood. "I am abundantly satisfied in Thy saying, 'This is my body.'"—"My faith and my experience tell me there is an efficacy therein, beyond the power of any other thing. Alas! the Flesh would profit me nothing.—Sure I am This is Thy Body in Sacrament, it communicates to us the blessings and benefits thereof, and though presented in a figure, and by a holy rite, yet it is to all its purposes that which it doth represent; I will therefore receive it as Thy Body." "Thou hast already given me Thy Holy Body to cleanse my nature, and now Thou art preparing Thy precious Blood to wash away my guilt.—Thou hast said This Cup is the Communion of Thy Blood, and Thy truth is unquestionable. I will receive it, therefore, as the Blood of the everlasting Covenant.

"The second happiness assured by this Holy Eucharist is, that we are thereby united to Jesus, so as to have fellowship with Him.—We have—participated of that Spirit which quickens the great mystical body of Christ."

It was the opinion, then, of Dean Comber, that the consecrated elements "are to be esteemed as the very body and blood of Christ:" that we are to be "abundantly satisfied" in his saying "This is my body:" that we are to have "faith" that "it is done as He hath commanded," to be "sure that it is His body in a Sacrament," and "receive it as His body," though presented to us in a figure," since "it is to all its purposes that which it doth represent." He believed that "every duly disposed com

municant doth receive really the body and blood of Christ in and by the elements: that He “gives Himself and the salutary benefits of His death,” and that “the advantages are real, and the effect more certain than if we ate and drank His natural flesh and blood;” for “the flesh would profit nothing;” and “there is an efficacy” in the Sacrament, “beyond the power of any other thing.” But that “it is by faith” we receive, and in receiving we “embrace the crucified Redeemer.”

Dean Comber, then, gives no testimony to the doctrine which asserts “The Real Presence” of our Lord’s glorified body in the Sacrament.

ARCHBISHOP WAKE.

“The bread which we break is, not only in figure and similitude, but by a real spiritual Communion, His Body. The Cup of Blessing which we bless is by the same Communion His Blood.”

Of the Archbishop’s doctrine there can be no doubt when one reads this which I shall subjoin:—

“That which is given by the priest is, as to its substance, bread and wine; as to its sacramental nature and signification it is the figure or representation of Christ’s body and blood, which was broken and shed for us. The very body and blood of Christ as yet it is not. But being with faith and piety received by the communicant, it becomes to him, by the blessing of God and the grace of the Holy Spirit, the very body and blood of Christ.”

“As for his Divine nature, that being infinite, he is by virtue thereof everywhere present. But in his human nature, and particularly his body, he is in heaven only; nor can that be otherwise present to us on earth than by figure and representation, or else by such a communion as I have before been speaking of.” *

JOHNSON.

“He [St. Paul] supposes that the Body and Blood of Christ are communicated to us by the Bread and Wine in the Holy Eucharist. . . . And—he surely takes it for granted that the Body and Blood are actually there, whether they discern it or not.”

“The full and true notion of the Eucharist is, that it is a religious Feast upon Bread and Wine, that have first been offered in sacrifice to Almighty God, and are become the mysterious Body and Blood of Christ.

“It was the universal belief of the ancients, that, by the special presence

* On the Catechism, Sect. 48, 49, Lond. 1827, 360, 361, 362.

of the Holy Spirit, the Bread and Wine were made the Body and Blood of Christ, in life and power as they were before in figure or representation. As the natural Body of Christ was formed in the womb by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost; so they expected, and prayed that, by the operation of the same Spirit, the Bread and Wine might be made the Body and Blood in a more effectual manner than they were, when offered to God as mere representatives: and it was their certain belief that the Bread thus consecrated by the secret influence of the Spirit, was the very Body of Christ, in power and energy, and to all intents and purposes of religion, and so far as it was possible for one thing to be made another, without change of substance."

"They even affirmed the Bread and Wine to remain after consecration; but that by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost they were Christ's Body and Blood, not only by way of type or figure, but in real power and effect."

"The consecrated Bread and Wine being thus, by the secret operation of the Holy Spirit, made the Body and Blood of Christ, did fully answer the characters which Christ gives us of his Flesh and Blood in this sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel."

Johnson's doctrine might be justly gathered from these places: but the following places will speak with sufficient clearness for themselves.

"The Bread and Wine are not the Body and Blood, in themselves considered, nor merely by their resembling or representing the Body and Blood, but by the inward invisible power of the Spirit, by Which the Sacramental Body and Blood are made as powerful and effectual for the ends of religion as the natural Body itself could be if It were present. And it is on this account that It is called Christ's spiritual and mysterious Body."

"The ancients—believed the material Bread and Wine to be the spiritual Body and Blood of Christ, on account of the presence and invisible operation of the Holy Ghost in and by those elements."

"The holy Fathers had a just sense of the dignity of the Christian mysteries, and the very centre in which all their reasonings and arguments on this subject meet, is this; that the Holy Ghost, at the prayers of the Priests and people, is in a peculiar manner present, and imparts a secret power to the Sacramental Body and Blood, by which they are made to be in energy and effect, though not in substance, the very Body and Blood which they represent."

"And it is to be observed, that by this means—[the invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the elements] the Eucharistical Bread and Wine are made the most perfect and consummate representatives of the Body and Blood of Christ. They are not only substituted by His appointment and command to this purpose, but they are by the power of the Spirit, which is communicated to them so often as the celebration of this mystery is re-

peated, made the lively efficacious Sacrament of His Body and Blood : for the Holy Spirit is Christ's invisible and Divine deputy in His Church."*

The reader must have observed in all these extracts from Johnson, that he does not speak of the presence of our Lord Himself in the Sacrament, or in the elements or under their forms : and that Johnson, conceiving that he had the ancient Fathers with him, held that the bread became the body, and the wine became the blood, through "the special presence of the Holy Ghost," who was invoked to come down upon them : that by the "secret influence" and "operation," "by the inward invisible power," of the Spirit, who is "in a peculiar manner present, and imparts a secret power" to the elements, they "are made the lively efficacious Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ," "His spiritual body," "the most perfect and consummate representatives of His body and blood," "the very body of Christ, in power and energy, and to all intents and purposes of religion." And from this, he "takes it for granted that the body and blood of Christ, are actually there, whether "it be discerned or not."

In all this, there is nothing of the presence of that body of our Lord itself which was born of the Virgin, and suffered upon the cross. Neither are the elements supposed to be his body and blood, by the presence and operation of his Godhead : but by the power, operation, and presence of the Holy Spirit, who "is Christ's invisible and Divine deputy in His Church."

ARCHBISHOP SHARP.

"Do we not in the Sacrament truly partake of the Body and Blood of Christ? God forbid that any one should deny it. To all worthy receivers the Body and Blood of Christ is both given and likewise received by them. This is the sense of the Church of England, when she doth so often declare that she owns the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood to all that worthily receive the Sacrament." "We do indeed own that Christ is really present in the Sacrament to all worthy receivers."

A real presence, certainly, is declared in these places of the Archbishop of York, but it is not "The Real Objective Presence" which Doctor Pusey propounds to us. It is a presence "in the Sacrament" which the Archbishop declares. He does not say, in the elements or their form : nor that it is a presence absolute there, a presence whether the Sacrament be received or not, a

* The Unbloody Sacrifice, Lib. of Angl. Cath. Divinity, I. ii. 1, Oxford, 1847, I. 266, 267, 272.

presence to all, whether they be duly disposed or not; but he owns that "Christ is really present in the Sacrament to all worthy receivers." But in other places he says that "the literal sense is impossible;" "that the Body and Blood of Christ, in the sense of our Church, are only the benefits of Christ's passion;—our eating and drinking of that Body and Blood, is our being made partakers of those benefits." "Christ hath but one body, and that body is now in heaven, and not here, and she [our Church] declares further, that that body which we eat is for the nourishment of our souls (which the body of Christ in a proper literal sense, though it were here present, could not contribute anything to)."*

LESLIE.

"Nor can the shew-bread in the temple be called the bread of our God so properly, so strictly, so eminently, as the Bread in the Holy Sacrament, which is the Body of Christ. [And *we being many, are one Bread and one Body; for we are all partakers of that one Bread*, 1 Cor. x. 17.] And does not then holiness and honour belong as much, at least, to the Evangelical Priesthood, who offer this Bread of our God, as the priests under the Law who set the shew-bread upon the holy table in the temple? And is not the one as properly the office of a priest as the other?"

That "the bread in the holy Sacrament—is the body of Christ," is one thing; that the bread contains, or that its form has under it, the Real Presence of his glorified body is quite another. And this, which is the doctrine of "The Real Presence," Leslie had no thought of saying. He says:—

"There is not one man in your communion [the Roman] but must own that the words of institution are figurative."—"Our Saviour was then fulfilling a type of himself, which was the Passover, and he kept to the same Phrase or Form of words which was customary with the Jews in their celebration of it, only putting himself in the room of his type, as instead of *This is the Paschal Lamb which was slain for us in Ægypt*, he said, *This is my body which is given for you*. And when Moses sprinkled the Blood, it was with this form of words, *This is the Blood of the Testament which God hath enjoined unto you*. Instead of which Old Testament Christ said, *This is my Blood of the New Testament*. In which words there is no difficulty at all, for no mortal can understand these words of Moses in a transubstantial sense, and why should they the same words when Christ spoke them, following the very form of the words of Moses? This made it familiar and easy to the Apostles, who called many things hard sayings which were not so difficult as this, and yet expressed no wonder or astonishment at these words of Christ, which had been impossible for them not to have done, if they had taken them in the sense of

* Goode on the Eucharist, II. 954.

Transubstantiation, for it was a new thing, never before heard of or thought of in the world."

"If all the benefits of the death of Christ be conveyed to us in this Sacrament, by a figurative and symbolical representation of his Body and Blood, and that it be so instituted for this end; it is to all intents and purposes as beneficial to us, as if we had eat the Flesh of Christ off his bones, or drank the very Blood, that came out of his side; which is abhorrent to think, and to avoid which you call this an unbloody Sacrifice. But how is it unbloody, if it be real blood, even the selfsame Blood which was shed upon the Cross?" *

BRETT.

"How shall they discern the Lord's Body, if they are not taught that the Lord's Body is here present?"—"I will quicken or give him life by My Spirit, that Spirit by which My Body lives, and whose quickening or life-giving virtue I will impart to that material thing which I shall make my Body and Blood, when I give this natural Body and Blood of mine for the life of the world, or the redemption of mankind. It is not Christ's doctrine that quickens us and gives us life, but His Spirit, that Spirit which gives life to His own Body, and which together with His Body and Blood, or something which He dignifies with that name, which He has appointed to give us life. The Body and Blood, then, or Flesh and Blood, which in this Chapter He promised to give (saying, *My flesh will I give*) for our food which should nourish us unto eternal life, can be no other than that Bread and Wine which He gave when He instituted the Holy Eucharist or Lord's Supper, at which time He dignified them with the name and virtue of His Body and Blood." "He communicated this Bread and Wine to His disciples, and called these elements His Body and Blood."

"But now I will make good that promise to you; here is Bread and Wine, which I have now offered to God, and have blessed them with My Spirit, and thereby made them My Body and Blood in power and virtue: these I now give to you, eat the one and drink the other, and you shall receive all the benefits and blessings you then heard Me promise to those who should eat My Flesh and drink My Blood."

Thus Brett asserts "that the Lord's Body is here present," but not "His own body." It is "that material thing," "or something," "those elements," "that bread and wine," which He "called," and "dignified with the name and virtue of His body and blood," to which He imparted the "quickenning or life-giving virtue" of His Spirit, "that Spirit which gave life to His own body," the "bread and wine," which He "blessed with His Spirit," and "thereby made them His body and blood in power and virtue."

* The Case stated between the Churches of Rome and England, sect. 37. Lond. 1721, I. 517, 518.

Truly the doctrine of "The Real Presence" is not to be discovered here.

WHEATLEY.

"These elements are now consecrated, and so become the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ." "A Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, is what our Church frequently asserts in this very office of Communion, in her Articles, in her Homilies, and her Catechism, particularly in the two latter, in the first of which she tells us, *Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent:—but the Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost—is through Faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, &c., who therefore* (as she further instructs us in the Catechism) *verily and indeed take and receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper.* This is the doctrine of the Church in relation to the Real Presence in the Sacrament."

Wheatley says, as so many others say, that the consecrated elements are "become the body and blood of Christ." And undoubtedly in the same sense in which they—are—become, they really are, the body and blood of Christ; and therefore the body and blood of Christ are really present—in that sense. To be consistent therefore with himself, it must be in this sense that he speaks of "a Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist." But this is not "The Real Presence" to which he is cited to testify. That is "The Real Presence" of our Lord living and glorified in the bread and wine, or under their forms; but the presence spoken of by Wheatley is not any other presence,—at least he does not say anything to inform us, or lead to the supposition, that he meant any other, than of the body and blood of Christ he had spoken of before, namely, that body and blood of Christ which the bread and wine by consecration had "become."

The question of the teaching of the Church of England must be reserved for another place. We have only to remark here, that so far as the words, cited by Wheatley from the Homily, express his own belief, there is a very remarkable abstinence from any expression of "The Real Presence." Stating that "thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent," he goes on to say what it is, in such fervid words, that if he had believed the doctrine of "The Real Presence," as it is propounded in this generation, he must have

said something like this :—“ but the very Lord Himself, His very body, and His very blood.” But leaving out those other words of the Homily drawn from “ the Scripture, the Table of the Lord ; the Bread and Cup of the Lord ; the Memory of Christ ; the Annunciation of His Death ; ” Wheatley says only, that the Supper of the Lord is “ the Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost—is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful.” No believer in “ The Real Presence ” could have written, or would now write, in such terms as these : especially when his own words, and the tenor of his argument or statement, so plainly led the reader to expect him to say, what it is that is not absent, what it is that is present.

And I cannot but think that if Wheatley thought of what he was saying, and measured his words to an accurate expression of his thoughts, he would not have said that the “ doctrine of our Church in relation to the Real Presence in the Sacrament ” is “ entirely different from the doctrine of Transubstantiation,” if he himself believed, or thought, that the doctrine of our Church retained the main point, the very hinge of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, that “ after the consecration of the bread and wine, Our Lord, Jesus Christ, true God and Man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of these sensible things.” A doctrine which retains this dogma, could not be “ entirely different from the doctrine of Transubstantiation.” But this is the doctrine of “ The Real Objective Presence.” I must conclude, therefore, that Wheatley is not justly cited as evidence for it.

BISHOP WILSON.

“ Send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, that He may make this Bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this Cup the Blood of Thy Christ.” “ May I always receive the Holy Sacrament in the same meaning, intention, and blessed effect, with which Jesus Christ administered it to His Apostles in His last Supper.”

I must add here, immediately from one of Bishop Wilson’s Sermons, a few more words :—

“ Let a man, I say, be never so unlearned, yet he will easily understand, that he is not to look upon, and receive this bread and wine as common food, but as holy representatives of Christ’s Body and Blood, made such by an especial blessing of God.” * “ The Bread and Wine are to represent

* Sermon lxxvi. Works, Angl. Cath. Lib. III. 277.

the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. And being consecrated and received by us, they are the Body and Blood of Christ, in virtue and power." "The material Bread and Wine do become the Body and Blood of Christ in a spiritual manner, by prayer and the operation of the Holy Ghost."* "He then offered up Himself to God in the symbols of bread and wine, as a pledge of his real and natural body which he was just going to offer to God for the sins of the world. His sacramental body was given, offered, before he suffered. It was made his sacramental body, by his almighty word, none but God could do it, we therefore invoke the Holy Ghost one God with him, to make the elements what Christ himself made them, his sacramental body, it being the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. . . . It is the Spirit, i.e. the Holy Ghost, sent upon them in the prayer of the priest, which conveys to us the seed of eternal life." "We feed on this bread, now endued with a life-giving Spirit." †

It was the doctrine, then, of Bishop Wilson that God the Holy Ghost is sent down upon the bread and wine: that by his "operation" they are made and "do become the body and blood of Christ," his "sacramental body" and blood; being not "his real and natural body" and blood; but "holy representatives of Christ's body and blood;" "a pledge of his real and natural body;" the body and blood of Christ "in a spiritual manner," "in virtue and power:" that "the Holy Ghost, sent upon the bread and wine—conveys to us the seeds of eternal life," and that they are thus "endued with a life-giving Spirit."

One must therefore look in vain for any proof that Bishop Wilson taught the doctrine of "The Real Presence."

GRABE.

"The English Divines teach that in the Holy Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ, under the species, that is, the signs, of Bread and Wine, are offered to God, and become a representation of the Sacrifice of Christ once made upon the cross, whereby God may be rendered propitious."

Whether the allegation as to the teaching of "the English Divines," here made by Grabe, be true or not, is a question which we have not here to consider: but supposing that he has expressed his own sentiments in this extract, we see that he believed "the body and blood of Christ" to be "under the species,—the signs, of bread and wine:" but if, as he says, "the body and blood of Christ—become a representation of the sacrifice of Christ once made upon the cross;" there is no kind of resemblance of the doctrine of "The Real Presence" to be found in his words.

* Plain and Short Directions, IV. 121.

† I am indebted for these extracts to Dean Goode's work, pp. 935, 936.

BISHOP PHILLPOTTS.

“When any of us speak of this great mystery in terms best suited to its spiritual nature; when, for instance, we speak of the Real Presence of Christ’s Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist, there is raised a cry, as if we were symbolizing with the Church of Rome, and as if this Presence, because it is real, can be nothing else than the gross, carnal, corporeal presence indicated in Transubstantiation.”

“It is very true, that none of these declarations or formularies [of our Church] use the phrase ‘real Presence,’ and therefore, if any should attempt to impose the use of that phrase as necessary, he would be justly open to censure for requiring what the Church does not require. But, on the other hand, if we adopt the phrase, as not only aptly expressing the doctrine of the Church, but also as commended to our use by the practice of the soundest Divines of the Church of England, in an age more distinguished for depth, as well as soundness, of theology than the present—such as Archbishops Bramhall, Sharp, and Wake, (all of whom do not only express their own judgment, but also are witnesses of the general judgment of the Church in and before their days; ‘No genuine son of the Church of England,’ says Bramhall, ‘did ever deny a true real Presence;’) if, I say, we adopt the phrase used by such men as these, and even by some of those, who at the Reformation sealed with their blood their testimony to the truth against the doctrine of Rome, (I allude especially to Bishops Ridley and Latimer—and even to Cranmer, who, when he avoided the phrase so abused by the Romanists, did yet employ equivalent words,) it will be sufficient for the justification both of them and of us to show that the language of the Church itself does in fact express the same thing, though in different terms. Still, I fully admit, that Christian discretion would bid us forbear from the use of the phrase, if the objection to it were founded on a sincere apprehension of giving offence to tender consciences; and not, as there is too much reason to believe, on an aversion to the great truth which it is employed to express.”

What was the date of this Charge of Bishop Phillpotts, from which the above passage was extracted, I do not know; for no date is given with it in the *Catena*: but I cannot help suspecting, that if the Bishop were now living and in full possession of his well-known powers of mind, he might have seen and acknowledged another reason in addition, for avoiding the use of the term, which he here admitted it might in some circumstances be a matter of “Christian discretion” to “forbear.”

I may be mistaken in thinking, but I do venture to think, that the Bishop used the term in a very different sense from that which he is here brought in to support. He identified his own opinion with the opinion of those whom he justly called “the soundest Divines of the Church of England;” and in

particular, of Archbishops Bramhall, Sharp, and Wake: and being, no doubt, therefore well acquainted with their doctrine, his acute and logical mind would never have identified it with the doctrine of "The Real Presence" as it is taught now-a-days. When Archbishop Bramhall said that he rested in these words of Christ "This is my body, This is my blood;" Bishop Phillpotts would have seen that this was very different from saying, "This contains or has in it the presence of my glorified body." When Archbishop Wake said: "In His human nature, and particularly His body, He is in heaven only; nor can that be otherwise present to us on earth, than by figure and representation:" and when Archbishop Sharp said that "the literal sense [of the words of institution] is impossible;" "that the Body and Blood of Christ, in the sense of our Church, are only the benefits of Christ's passion;" that the body of Christ "is now in heaven, and not here;" and that "that body which we eat is for the nourishment of our souls which the body of Christ in a proper and literal sense, though it were here present, would not contribute anything to:" I cannot pay so ill a compliment to the memory of Bishop Phillpotts, as to imagine for a moment that he would identify the doctrine of these Prelates with the doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence," which is taught by Dr. Pusey.

Nor can the reader fail to observe, that although the Bishop defended the use of the term "Real Presence," he did not state his own views of the doctrine; nor even intimate them any further than his reference to Archbishops Bramhall, Sharp, and Wake, may be taken to intimate that his opinions agreed with theirs.

The Catena concludes with a "summary of the Anglo-Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist," from Mr. Palmer's treatise on the Church: (not vol. II., but vol. I. part II. c. vii. p. 526, &c.,) from which I select the following passages.

"This Catholic and Apostolic Church [the Church of England] has always avoided any attempt to determine too minutely the mode of the true Presence in the Holy Eucharist."—"Taking as her immoveable foundation the words of Jesus Christ: 'This is My Body . . . This is My Blood, of the New Covenant;' and 'Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life;' she believes, that the Body or Flesh, and the Blood of Jesus Christ, the Creator and Redeemer of the world, both God and man, united indivisibly in one Person, and verily and indeed given to, taken, eaten, and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, under

the outward sign or form of bread and wine, which is, on this account, the 'partaking or communion of the Body and Blood of Christ.' She believes that the Eucharist is not the sign of an *absent* body, and that those who partake of it receive not merely the figure, or shadow, or sign of Christ's body, but the reality itself. And as Christ's divine and human natures are inseparably united, so she believes that we receive in the Eucharist, not only the Flesh and Blood of Christ, but Christ Himself, both God and man." "She holds that the presence (and therefore the eating) of Christ's Body and Blood, though true, is altogether heavenly and spiritual." "Believing according to the Scriptures, that Christ ascended in His natural body into heaven, and shall only come from thence at the end of the world; she rejects for this reason, as well as the last, any such real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood as is 'corporal' or organised, that is according to the known and earthly mode of existence of a body.

"Resting on the Divine promise, 'Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life,' she regards it as the more pious and probable opinion, that the wicked, those who are totally devoid of true and living faith, do not partake of the Holy Flesh of Christ in the Eucharist, God withdrawing from them so 'divine' a gift, and not permitting His enemies to partake of it. And hence she holds, that such a faith is 'the means by which the body of Christ is received and eaten,' 'a necessary instrument in all these holy ceremonies;' because it is the essential qualification on our parts, without which that Body is not received; and because 'without faith it is impossible to please God.'"

"The Lord's Body is truly present in that Sacrament. Hence it is that the Church believing firmly in the real Presence of the 'precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ,' speaks of the Eucharist, 'as high and holy mysteries,' exhorts us to consider the 'dignity of that holy mystery,' that 'heavenly feast,' that 'holy table,' 'the banquet of that most heavenly food,' even 'the King of kings' table.'"

We have not here to consider the accuracy of this representation of the doctrine of our Church. We have only to deal with it as an expression of the doctrine of the author himself: although "the sanction of the Most Reverend the Archbishops of Canterbury and Armagh" is claimed for it in the *Catena*, somewhat too confidently, I think.

This learned and judicious writer, then, asserts the "true Presence," the "real Presence of Christ's body and blood:" but he denies "any such real Presence of Christ's body and blood, as is corporal or organical;" maintaining that it is "altogether heavenly and spiritual." He believes "that the body or flesh, and the blood of Jesus Christ—both God and man,—are verily and indeed given to, eaten, and received by the faithful," and "regards it as the more pious and probable opinion that the

wicked, those who are totally devoid of true and living faith, do not partake of the holy flesh of Christ in the Eucharist:” and therefore “that such a faith—is the essential qualification on our part, without which that body is not received.” But that the “immoveable foundation” of this doctrine is, “the words of Jesus, ‘This is my body, This is my blood.’”

Mr. Palmer, therefore, building on this “immoveable foundation,” must be taken to believe that the bread—is—the body, and that the wine—is—the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ: and to mean nothing inconsistent with this. He does not affirm, as the doctrine of “The Real Presence” affirms, the real presence of our Lord’s body and blood under the form of bread and wine: though he says, that the body and blood of Christ “are verily and indeed given—and received—under the outward sign or form of bread and wine;” from which some would infer, that if they are given, they are present, under the form: but he qualifies this by saying, that it is to “the faithful” they are “given:” that faith is the essential qualification without which that body is not received; and that “the wicked—do not partake of it.” It does not seem, therefore, at all clear, that Mr. Palmer teaches “The Real Objective Presence of our Lord’s body and blood under the form of bread and wine.”

But the “true” and “real presence” of the body and blood of Christ, he affirms is not “corporal or organical.” The expression is, at least, paradoxical; and at all events, inconsistent with the doctrine of “The Real Presence,” which Dr. Pusey and those who symbolise with him, teach. For Archdeacon Wilberforce says that “the mention of our Lord’s Body and Blood implies the presence of His man’s nature,” and “by virtue of that personal union, whereby the manhood was taken into God, it involves the presence of His Godhead also:” * in short, it implies the presence of “Himself, Godhead, Soul, and Body;” whole Christ, that is, as the Romanists phrase it. This is the doctrine of “The Real Presence.” The whole organism of his body, his whole organical body, his human body, with all its organical parts: his body living; animated by his soul; and in hypostatic union with his Godhead. But Mr. Palmer says this body is not organically present, or more strictly in his own words, there is not an “organical presence” of his body in the Eucharist; which, I can only conjecture to mean, that it is not the organical body of our Lord which is present; or else that his

* Doctrines of the Holy Eucharist, 90, 91.

organical body is present, but not organically: and in either case, not really. For a body to be not bodily present, is to be absent; and any presence attributable to it, is but virtual: and for an organical body to be not organically present, is the same thing in other words.

I admit, that this may not be Mr. Palmer's view of the meaning of "a presence not organical:" but there is nothing in the expression of his views here presented to us, to lead to a different conclusion; nothing from which it is to be concluded that he has taught or intended to teach "The Real Objective Presence of our Lord Jesus Christ in His glorified body under the form of bread and wine."

Fuller consideration will be given in the proper place to his and other representations of the doctrine of our Church. In this place, we have only to record the conclusion, that not one of the Divines who have been cited as witnesses for the doctrine of "The Real Presence," as it is now taught by a party in the Church of England, has been found to give evidence in its favour.

As for the term itself, it has been by no means so commonly adopted, as has been imagined. Bishop Montagu, in the second or third decade of the seventeenth century, is the earliest of our Post-reformation writers to whom Dr. Pusey's collections have enabled me to trace its use, as expressive of their doctrine. And there can be little doubt that if there had been any earlier authorities, they would have been brought before us. But Bishop Montagu's doctrine was not of "The Real Presence," as it is now taught. He says:—

"We know not the manner: we do not busy ourselves about [a manner which is] impossible to be traced: we believe the thing done, and embrace what He said, 'This is My body, this is My blood.'" "We are ignorantly enough said of late to have denied the real presence." "His body and blood are in a figure given us to eat and to drink." "In the English Liturgy,—we never call [the elements] bread and wine as [we do] before [consecration,] but the body and the blood. For these elements exhibit them in reality, as all the Sacraments instituted by Christ [do exhibit] that which they figure."⁸¹ "The body is mystically represented. So also the body of the Church is the true and Real body of Christ but not carnal."

⁸¹ "Modum nescimus: non satagimus impervestigabilem: Rem factam credimus, et amplectimur quod *αὐτὸς ἔφη*, Hoc est Corpus meum, Hic est sanguis meus.—Realem nuper præsentiam negasse, satis imperite dicebamus. Corporis et sanguinis illius, quæ in *τύπῳ* porriguntur et propinantur nobis.—In Liturgicis certe Anglicanis—nunquam ut prius, Panem et Vinum, sed Corpus et Sanguinem appellamus.—Re vera enim exhibent illa Elementa, ut omnia a Christo instituta Sacramenta, quod figurant.—Ita

After Montagu, the term was adopted by White, Laud, Bramhall, Cosin, L'Estrange, Sharp, and Wheatley: but for a doctrine quite different, as we have seen, from that which is now called by the name of "The Real Presence." Overall speaks of "what our Church believeth and teacheth of the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament:" and says that the Romanists "will be upbraiding us for denying the Real Presence, whereas we believe better than they." Morton speaks of "a Real Presence which Protestants—profess:" but his own doctrine was of "a true Presence." Andrewes speaks of "a presence—no less true than" the Romanists believe. Jackson speaks of a "virtual presence:" Laud, of "the true and real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist:" Bramhall of "a true Real Presence:" Cosin, of "the true nature and the Real and Substantial Presence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament:" L'Estrange, of "that Real Presence which all sound Protestants seem to allow:" Sharp, of "the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood to all that worthily receive the Sacrament:" Wheatley, of "the doctrine of our Church in relation to the Real Presence in the Sacrament" being "entirely different from the doctrine of Transubstantiation:" and Phillpotts seems to use the term in the sense of Archbishops Bramhall, Sharpe, and Wake, whose doctrine, we have seen, was not that which the term, "Real Presence," properly expresses. All these views are perfectly consistent with each other: and they come to this, that there is a virtual, true, real, and substantial presence to all worthy receivers, allowed by all Protestants, entirely different from Transubstantiation, no less true, and better than Romanists believe. One and all of these Divines would have subscribed to this. And it implies that the Real Presence of the Romanists, is not a true presence, but, as Bishop Ridley says, "forged, phantastical, beside the authority of God's word, and," therefore, "perniciously brought into the Church."

Be it observed, also, that it is not the mode or manner of presence, but the presence itself, taught by the Church of Rome, to which these Divines imputed falsehood, and to which they oppose "a true presence:" although some, following Bishop Ridley, who said to his examiners, "both you and I herein agree, that in

non est hoc Corpus in utero virgineo efformatum, et procedens; sed est mystice representatum. Ita et Ecclesiæ corpus, Christi corpus verum et Reale est, sed non carnale."—*Θεολογικόν*, Lond. 1640, II. pp. 250, 259, 266, 284, 289.

the Sacrament is the very true, and natural Body and Blood of Christ," have said that the only difference between them and the Romanists as to the real presence, was concerning the mode of the presence; and others have said, that with the abatement of "Transubstantiation, and those things which are consequent of their determination of the manner of presence," there would be "no difference with" the Romanists "in this particular."* But they who now would appeal to such declarations in favour of their doctrine of "The Real Presence," fail to recognise the import of Ridley's and such like admissions, and how much is, of necessity, given up with Transubstantiation. Ridley believed that "the very, true, and natural body and blood of Christ" are "in the Sacrament," "spiritually by grace and efficacy:" and in this the Romanists would agree with him. But they differed in this, that he maintained that the body and blood of Christ are present in the Sacrament "by grace and efficacy" only: while they made "a grosser kind of being enclosing a natural, a lively, and a moving body, under the shape or form of bread and wine." And our Divines who followed him in the profession of agreement with the Romanists, as to the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, would all agree with him also, in disallowing the "grosser kind of being" or presence which the Romanists make. By the very terms, too, of the admission, that "the very, true, and natural body—and—blood of Christ" are "in the Sacrament," the living and glorified body is excluded; because if the blood be in it, the body is not living, but dead: and "The Real Presence" is virtually denied; because, the dead body and the blood shed cannot be really present.

With Transubstantiation, also, its necessary cause and foundation goes. It is not merely the change of the substance of the elements, but that from which it logically and necessarily comes; namely, the true, real, and substantial presence of the body of Christ in, or under the form of, the elements: for if the elements truly, really, and substantially contain the body of Christ, it can only be by the desition of the substance of the bread and wine. Such real presence, then, must be eliminated, to leave a doctrine "entirely different" as Wheatley says, "from the doctrine of Transubstantiation."

And lastly, so far as Dr. Pusey's *Catena* enables us to judge,—and I believe that the judgment is true,—Bilson, Hooker,

* Bramhall, fol. ed. 485, Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol. Works, III. 165.

Overall, Andrewes, Morton, Donne, Sutton, Forbes, Mede, Sparrow, Hammond, Fell, Thorndike, Taylor, Ken, Hackett, Beveridge, Bull, Hickes, Comber, Wake, Johnson, Leslie, Brett, Wilson, and Grabe, are found to have declined the use of the term "Real Presence" for their own doctrine. These, therefore, with Ridley, make up the number of twenty-seven out of the thirty-seven witnesses summoned by Dr. Pusey, who have declined the very name of "The Real Presence." And of the Divines who did adopt it, not one has been found to use it for the doctrine which Dr. Pusey has cited them to establish for the faith of the Church of England.

This investigation is of no little importance: for one great argument for the doctrine of "The Real Presence," has been, the alleged belief and teaching of that doctrine by the great Divines of our Church: and there can be no doubt that many have been led to the acceptance of this doctrine by the application of this argument. It is therefore of great moment to have ascertained by careful and candid enquiry that the allegation is not true.

How the term "Real Presence," so new to Theology, came to be retained after the Reformation by Divines of the Church of England, may be sufficiently accounted for from these two causes: first, it admitted of at least two senses, in one of which they could accept it: and secondly, those who were engaged in controversy with Divines of Rome, desired by the use of the term to show that, although they rejected Transubstantiation, they were partakers of the body and blood of Christ as truly and really as those who retained that doctrine.

To me, I confess, notwithstanding so many great authorities, the use of the term seems to be a great mistake, and very prejudicial to sound doctrine. It is an uncatholic term: and being used in one sense, it has been too often taken in another. It has been used by great Divines of the Church of England to express her doctrine: but their use of it has been taken as a sanction for doctrine, which one and all of them would have repudiated, and which the Church does not teach.

Yet the authority of the Church of England is most confidently claimed for the doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence:" and therefore the next chapter must be devoted to an examination of this claim, whether it be a valid one or not.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

IN the preceding chapter we have found some of our Divines affirming that the Church of England teaches the doctrine of the real presence: and their words have been taken up by divines of the present day, who affirm that it is their doctrine of "The Real Presence" which was meant. We have seen how slender grounds there are for this affirmation: and we have now to enquire whether our Church does indeed teach a doctrine of the real presence; and if she does, whether the doctrine which she teaches is that which is now imputed to her. We begin with

THE CATECHISM,

since it contains the elements of Church doctrine, and is a guide to its fuller development. And the Catechism has this question and answer where it is treating of the Lord's Supper: "What is the inward part or thing signified?—The body and blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." On which Dr. Pusey remarks, that "The answer tells" the learner "that 'the inward part' of 'the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper' is not merely 'grace,' but the Body and Blood of Him who is the Author of grace, 'the Body and Blood of Christ'; and that these 'are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.'" For, it is argued, "the 'inward part,—or thing signified,' is, in the Lord's Supper, something distinct from the 'benefits' or 'grace':* the reason which appears to be alleged for this distinction, being, that whereas, with regard to the Sacrament of Baptism, we have the one question, "What is the inward and spiritual grace?"—we have for the Lord's Supper these two questions: "What is the inward part or thing signified?" and "What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?"

* The Real Presence, ii. pp. 161, 163.

And thus, it is concluded, the Catechism distinguishes the inward part of the Lord's Supper from the grace conveyed by it.

That "the benefits" are as distinct from "the inward part," as effects are from their causes, is quite clear: but "the benefits" and the "grace" are not therefore, the same, as is here assumed; nor the "grace" a distinct thing from "the inward part or thing signified." To make the "grace," "the inward and spiritual grace," a distinct thing from "the inward part or thing signified," is to make this Sacrament to consist of three parts, instead of the two, which the definition of a Sacrament assigns to it. St. Augustine, it is true, is cited for a determination, that there are three parts in this Sacrament—the *sacramentum*, the *res sacramenti*, and the *virtus sacramenti*. But St. Augustine is really not responsible for this determination. It appears to me to be only a theory built upon detached expressions in his works, and inconsistent with his meaning. Archdeacon Wilberforce says that St. Augustine "called—the inward part 'res sacramenti,' or 'virtus sacramenti,'" and that he "used somewhat vaguely the—expressions *res sacramenti* and *virtus sacramenti*"; but that they "were more accurately discriminated by later writers; they appropriated the words *res sacramenti*, or *thing signified*, to the inward part, while they reserved the expression, *virtus sacramenti*, for the 'benefits, whereof we are partakers thereby.'"*

The places of St. Augustine which are thus used I take to be these: "Because they understood the visible food spiritually, they hungered spiritually, they tasted spiritually, that they might be satiated spiritually. For we also this day receive visible food; but the Sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the Sacrament is another. How many receive of the altar and die, and die from receiving!" And in the fourth section after this: "The Sacrament of this thing, that is, of the unity of the body and blood of Christ, in some places daily, and in some places after certain intervals of days, is prepared on the Lord's table, and is taken from the Lord's table; by some to life, by some to perdition: but the thing itself of which it is the Sacrament, by every man to life, by none to perdition, whosoever may be partaker of it."⁸² St. Augustine, then, used the three expressions,

* Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, v. 119, 120.

⁸² "Quia visibilem cibum spiritualiter intellexerunt, spiritualiter esurierunt, spi-

Sacramentum, *virtus Sacramenti*, and *res Sacramenti*, but the two latter expressions he evidently used as synonymous. *Virtus Sacramenti*, he used to signify the food which the Fathers “spiritually understood, desired, tasted, and were satiated with”: and *Res Sacramenti*, he used for the same thing, the spiritual food of “the unity of the body and blood of Christ.” It is therefore inconsistent with the sense of Augustine to make the *virtus* and the *res Sacramenti* two distinct things: and his authority is cited in vain for a different definition of a Sacrament from that which is given in our Catechism; which tells us only of two parts in a Sacrament, “the outward visible sign and the inward spiritual grace”; and thus agrees with the saying of a Father more ancient than Augustine, that “the Eucharist consists of two things, an earthly, and a heavenly.”⁸³

The Catechism distinguishes Sacraments from sacraments; the Sacraments “instituted by Christ Himself, and generally necessary to salvation”; and sacraments which either were not instituted by Him, or are not necessary for all men. And it gives a clear definition of the former, telling us that they consist of two parts. It seems, therefore, very unreasonable to suppose that it should intend to teach, that one of the two Sacraments consists not of two parts only, but of three.

And with regard to each of the Sacraments, the Catechism shows their conformity to the definition it had given of them, as consisting each of two parts. It names “the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace” of each; but using a somewhat varied expression. “What is the outward visible sign or form in Baptism?—What is the outward part or sign in the Lord’s Supper?” And as there can be no doubt that the intention was to teach what in each Sacrament is the “outward and visible sign” meant in the definition, so having thus determined one part in each Sacrament, the Catechism then goes on to determine the other part in each: namely, what is

ritualiter gustaverunt, ut spiritualiter satiarentur. Nam et nos hodie accipimus visibilem cibum: sed aliud est Sacramentum, aliud virtus Sacramenti. Quam multi de altari accipiunt et moriuntur, et accipiendo moriuntur!—Hujus rei Sacramentum, id est, unitatis corporis et sanguinis Christi—alicubi quotidie, alicubi certis intervallis dierum in dominica mensa præparatur, et de mensa dominica sumitur; quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium: res vero ipsa cujus sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicumque ejus particeps fuerit.”—Tract. in Johan. XXVI. c. VI. xi. xv.; Migne, iii. 1611, 1614.

⁸³ Εὐχαριστία ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυία, ἐπιγείου τε, καὶ οὐρανοῦ.—Irenæus, V. xviii.

the "inward and spiritual grace" in each. "What is the inward and spiritual grace" of Baptism? "What is the inward part, or thing signified" in the Lord's Supper? And "the inward part" in the second question can only mean "the inward and spiritual grace," which is one of the two parts of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. This inward part, then, being thus determined, it surely cannot be said that the Catechism goes on to tell us of another part of the Sacrament not included in the definition. The outward and the inward part, complete each of the two Sacraments. And, therefore, as "water," which is "the outward visible sign" or form in Baptism; and "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness," which is "the inward and spiritual grace," complete that Sacrament: so "bread and wine," which is "the outward part" or sign in the Lord's Supper; and "the body and blood of Christ," which is "the inward part or thing signified," complete this Sacrament also. "The inward part or thing signified," is therefore the "inward and spiritual grace" of the Lord's Supper. And consequently, "the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby," are not the inward and spiritual grace intended in the definition.

A distinction, indeed, seems to be made by the question as to these benefits between the two Sacraments: but it is only in appearance; for "the benefits whereof we are partakers" by Baptism, are stated in the very beginning of the Catechism; "I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." And the benefits of the Lord's Supper exactly correspond to these: the members of Christ, the children of God, the inheritors of his kingdom, have "strengthening and refreshing" for their "souls by the body and blood of Christ," whose members and fellow-heirs they have been made by the other Sacrament.

The body and blood of Christ, then, is "the inward and spiritual grace" of the Lord's Supper: and the inward part "is not merely a grace; it is more; it is the Body and Blood of Christ":* but it is both; and the one is the other: the grace is the body and blood of Christ, and his body and blood is the grace. It is the highest and most divine grace: a grace above all other graces.

* The Real Presence, p. 163.

I cannot admit, therefore, the assertion, that, "in the Holy Eucharist, the *grace* of the Sacrament comes through the right reception of the *res Sacramenti*, or 'the inward part or thing signified':" though it be true that "to the faithful recipient, the 'thing signified,' and the 'grace' of the Sacrament, come in one;" for they must come in one, since they are one. I cannot admit that one may be severed from the other. Nor can I admit that the grace, the "inward part or thing signified," can be received without the "benefits" belonging to it.

The consideration of this point, however, properly belongs to another place, to which, therefore, it must be relegated. We are only concerned with it here as bearing upon the question of "The Real Presence:" and it bears upon it in this way. It is argued that "the inward part or thing signified in the Lord's Supper" may be received without "the inward and spiritual grace": and therefore that it, the body and blood of Christ, is present to the unworthy as well as to the worthy receiver. But this conclusion fails if, as has been shown, "the inward part or thing signified," and "the inward and spiritual grace" of this Sacrament, be the same thing.

The word "inward," again, seems to be taken by some as meaning that the thing signified, or the spiritual grace, in the Eucharist, is to be understood as in or under the outward part. I do not, indeed, remember to have seen any express argument to this effect; but I have seen the word printed "*inward*," with the evident intention to insinuate this. Our Church, however, does not teach that the grace of the Sacraments is in or under the sign or outward form in either of the Sacraments: most certainly it is not, nor does she teach that it is in the water of Baptism: nor can she intend that from her use of the word "inward," it should be understood that the inward grace of the Eucharist is in or under the outward form, any more than the grace of Baptism is in the water.

But the statement of the Catechism, that "the body and blood of Christ—are verily and indeed received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper," is accepted and urged as an irrefragable proof of "The Real Presence." For, it is argued, if we do receive them verily and indeed, "in order that we may receive them, they must be—there—for us to receive them."* And,

* The Real Presence, p. 166.

most undoubtedly, this would hold good if,—provided if,—it were granted or proved, that we receive with our hands and mouths, materially, corporally, and carnally, the very fleshly substance of our Lord's body and blood, in the same way as we eat and drink for our bodily sustenance. But it is not so that we partake of the body and blood of Christ. That divine feast is not governed by the laws of material substances: and it is not the height of faith, it is not faith at all, to think that it is under such laws. A spiritual feast requires or involves no presence—there,—in order to partake of it and to receive that of which it consists. That which has been, but now is not; that which has not been, nor is now, but is to be; the absent as well as the present; the past and the future; may form a feast as real, as strengthening and refreshing to our souls, as any material substance can be to our bodies. Spiritual food and drink may be “taken and received” as “verily and indeed,” as really and effectually, as that which enters the bodily mouth and goes to nourish our material frames. And I trust I may say without offence, that it is, in reality and at the bottom, something akin to materialism and rationalism, though most certainly latent and utterly unconscious, which requires that a spiritual feast should be present—there,—in order that we may receive it.

Since, then, the body and blood of Christ are the inward part or thing signified, the inward and spiritual grace, in the Lord's Supper: since “inward” does not mean, at least is not proved to mean, “in or under:” since the Catechism does not teach that the inward and spiritual grace, the body and blood of Christ, is taken and received by all communicants whether faithful or unfaithful: and since there is no necessity that they should be—there—in order to be received: it follows that this, which is the only part of the Catechism which is supposed to prove, does not prove, the doctrine of “The Real Presence.”

I must, indeed, think, that when the compilers and revisers of the Book of Common Prayer, and of its several parts, made use of the words “the body and blood of Christ,” they understood the meaning and force of these words; that they did not use “body” as synonymous with “blood:” and both together as meaning only “body:” but that they meant distinctly the body—and—the blood: not the body as containing the blood; but the body separately, and the blood separately. And I must

think that when they spoke of eating the flesh and drinking the blood, of Christ, they did not mean, eating the flesh of a living body, and drinking the blood from its veins: taking “the blood with the flesh:” but the flesh and blood of a sacrificed body. They had no idea of a thing so monstrous and horrible to imagine, as devouring a living body; or so impossible to conceive to be done, as eating a glorified body: and since our Lord’s body is no longer in the condition of a sacrifice; they never could have intended to teach the real presence of the body—and—blood of Christ in the Lord’s Supper.

The next part of our Prayer Book which is appealed to for proof that the Church of England teaches the doctrine of “The Real Presence” is—

THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

“It is our duty to render most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God our heavenly Father, for that He hath given his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament.”

On which Dr. Pusey says: “Christ is our Food:” “it is not, again, grace, nor effluences, nor gracious influences, derived in whatever way they might be, from our Divine Lord; but it is Himself who is declared to have been given to us to be ‘our Food’ ‘in that Holy Sacrament.’ And how ‘our Food?’ In no other way than we learnt before in our Catechism, because ‘in that Sacrament, we verily and indeed receive the Body and Blood of Christ.’” †

The conclusion is not expressed; but it is evidently intended that the reader should draw it for himself, to the same effect as before; namely, that “Christ must be—there, his body and blood must be—there—for us to receive them:” a necessity only, if we are to conceive of spiritual as of bodily food.

In the Exhortation, again, “At the time of the celebration of the Communion,” it is said that “the benefit is great, if with a true, penitent heart, and lively faith, we receive that holy Sacrament; for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us;

* The Real Presence, ii. 167.

† Pp. 167, 168.

we are one with Christ, and Christ with us." And it cannot be doubted, that in these words "our Church has embodied—the teaching of our Lord" in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him:" and that "this indwelling is so great, and so near, and so close, that 'we are one with Him, and He with us.'"*

The Prayer, as it is sometimes called, of humble access, has this petition: "Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us." And Dr. Pusey remarks: "We are not, then, according to this prayer, only in a general way cleansed by the Precious Blood of Christ, through faith in Him. Our cleansing comes to us through our actual contact with that sacred Body and Blood. It is 'Christ within us,' His Body and Blood within us. We pray God the Father, 'Grant us, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body,' plainly by His body which we have eaten, 'and our souls may be washed by His most Precious Blood,' plainly His Blood which we have drunken."† It would have been more accurate to say: "Plainly, by His most blessed body and blood," of which we pray in the Prayer of Consecration, that "we may be partakers."

"Grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood."

Again, in delivering the bread and the cup to the communicants, the priest is to say: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee—The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee,—preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." And Dr. Pusey says: "Plainly, not in this place, The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, as it is in heaven, at the right hand of God, from which we have no direct influence; which does not in any way that has been revealed to us, 'preserve' us. In that Sacred Body, indeed,

* P. 169.

† P. 170.

our Lord intercedes for us, and continually exhibits, in the presence of the Father, those glorious scars, the tokens of His Cross and saving Passion. In It He is present there; our High Priest for ever, 'who ever liveth to make intercession for us.' 'In his Blood we have redemption.' Yet nowhere in Holy Scripture is any benefit spoken of, as derived directly from his Body, except as received by us in the Holy Eucharist." * And how, one may ask, is it received in the Holy Eucharist, but as it was given? the body which was—given,—the blood which was—shed—for us. "Plainly not, as it is in heaven." But his body in heaven, "as it is at the right hand of the Father," glorified, is the only body, the only personal body, which He has. That body alone can be present anywhere. And that body, as it was given, is nowhere in the whole world; and therefore cannot be present anywhere. His body—and—his blood, his blood poured out from his body, exist not in the whole compass of creation, nor even in heaven itself. The real presence, therefore, of his body—and—blood is an absolute impossibility, and our Liturgy does not assert it.

Since, therefore, Dr. Pusey so justly says, that it is not our Lord's body "as it is in heaven" which is meant in the words with which the priest delivers the bread; his conclusion is clearly wrong on his own premisses, that "The prayer 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul,' can mean no other than that Body which had just been spoken of in the Prayer of Consecration, 'the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ,'—present—by virtue of His words: 'This is my Body.'" †—That "it can mean no other Body than that which we had just prayed to eat aright," is most clear; but that this body is not "present," is a necessary corollary of the argument.

Between a denial that it is our Lord's body "as it is in heaven," which is in the Eucharist to "preserve" us, sound argument can allow no escape from a denial of "The Real Presence" of his body and blood, in that Sacrament.

The last place in the Communion Service which I find cited for the doctrine of "The Real Presence" is in the Post Communion:—

"We most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries

* P. 172.

† P. 173.

with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ: and dost assure us thereby of Thy favour and goodness towards us, and that we are members incorporate in the Mystical Body of Thy Son."

Thus, assuredly, "all harmonises,"—to use Dr. Pusey's words:—"all speaks of the actual gift of the precious Body and Blood of our Saviour." But not, therefore, of "The Real Presence." "The inward part or thing signified" by the outward part, "the inward and spiritual grace;" which, with the outward part or sign, makes up the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is "the body and blood of Christ:" his body and blood "are verily and indeed taken and received in the Lord's Supper:" it is "taken and received by the faithful;" "we spiritually eat his flesh and drink his blood, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament:" Christ is given "to be our spiritual food in these holy mysteries;" and that "our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood:" his body and blood are given to "preserve our souls and bodies unto everlasting life:" "God the Father Himself feeds us with that most precious body and blood."* But for all this, seeing that it is a "spiritual grace," "spiritual food," to be taken "by the faithful," to be spiritually eaten, to produce spiritual benefits: seeing that it is not subject to the laws which govern material things: all is possible, the body and blood of Christ can be taken to preserve soul and body unto everlasting life, and God can feed us with that most precious body and blood; and yet they shall not be present, nor is any real presence of them possible.

And again, it is not said that the body and blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received by the" unfaithful: it is not said that we eat his flesh and drink his blood if we receive the holy Sacrament without "a true penitent heart and lively faith": it is not said that God "vouchsafes to feed with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ," those who have not "duly received these holy mysteries." And, therefore, it is not proved to be the doctrine of our Liturgy, that there is a Real Objective Presence of the body and blood of Christ in or under the form of the bread and wine.

* P. 183.

THE ARTICLES,

Of which so much must be here cited as bear upon this question of "The Real Presence."

The 25th Article says, that "Sacraments ordained of God be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.—And to such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation."

The 28th Article says: "The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death; insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.—The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith."

The 29th Article is entitled "Of the wicked which eat not the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper"; and says that "The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustine saith), the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a thing."

And now the sole question here before us is, do these Articles, or do they not, furnish any proof that "The Real Presence" is the doctrine of the Church of England?

But in this division of our subject the reader is to be cautioned, as in fact he must be cautioned throughout the whole enquiry, to bear most carefully in mind what the doctrine of "The Real Presence" is, as it is now taught. He must not be allowed to forget that this doctrine asserts the real, actual presence of our Lord's glorified body, that is, of our Lord Him-

self, Body, and Soul, and Godhead, in or with the elements of bread and wine, or under their form. This must be strictly brought into comparison with every branch of the evidence alleged for the doctrine, whether it be from Holy Scripture or from the ancient Fathers, from the Divines or from the formularies of the Church of England.

With this doctrine, then, clearly in his mind, the reader will be at a loss to imagine by what process of argumentation it can be proposed to prove it from the Articles of Religion in our Church. He will be prepared to regard it as a signal feat of logic, which shall bring out this doctrine as the conclusion from the premisses contained in the Articles before us.

This, indeed, is a feat which Dr. Pusey does not really attempt. He does not evolve his doctrine from the Articles alone; but assuming that it has been proved from the Catechism and the Liturgy, he argues that the teaching of the Articles must be consistent with the teaching of these formularies, and must therefore teach his doctrine. "We ought not to conceive," he rightly says, "that our Church contradicts herself; or that she would teach us, in any indirect—way, what should unsay the simple teaching by which she moulded our thoughts in our earliest years. She *does* not, if we will but draw out *her* meaning out of her own Articles, not bring our own preconceived theories with them. As many of us as have been taught, as the Church would teach us, have been brought by the Providence of God to the Articles, through and out of the teaching of the Catechism, and through the teaching and prayers of the Communion Service, which incorporates that teaching into our belief through our devotion." I most entirely agree with this, and subscribe with all my heart to the opinion that "Prayer is ever the deepest teacher. Prayer speaks, face to face, with God; prayer pleads to God, asks of God, looks to God, with full assurance of faith for what it asks."* I cannot conceive of any man deliberately incorporating in his prayers a shred of doctrine which he does not heartily believe: and much less of a Church imposing on her members the expression to God of a faith which she does not also impose on their belief. I have always felt that the invocations of our Litany impose upon all that join in them the faith of the Holy Trinity, even

* P. 284.

more solemnly and strictly than the Athanasian Creed, and bind the faithful members of our Church as distinctly to the logical consequences or details of that doctrine, as that creed sets them forth.

Admitting, then, in the fullest sense, and maintaining as heartily as Dr. Pusey, the entire unity of doctrine throughout our authorised formularies, I proceed to consider whether the Articles do or do not give evidence for the doctrine of "The Real Presence." And here it is evident from what has been said, that we must expect to find the same doctrine in the Articles as in the formularies previously examined. If we have not found the doctrine in them, we shall not expect to find it in the Articles: but if we shall find it in the Articles, it will follow, as the other formularies must agree with them, that if they do not explicitly set it forth, they must implicitly involve it.

But it has been shown that neither the Catechism nor the Communion Service teaches the doctrine of "The Real Presence":—let the reader bear the doctrine carefully in mind.—And therefore we must deal with Dr. Pusey's arguments, as moved away from the foundation on which he thought he was to place them, from the position, namely, that the doctrine had been proved from the formularies previously considered.

How the Articles were worded originally, and by what process they were moulded into their present form, is an interesting, and in some respects, an important consideration: but I do not see that it really affects the question before us. Whether a doctrine which does not contradict, or is not inconsistent with, any of the Articles, may be held, is a distinct and very different question from "What is the doctrine which they teach and require to be believed and taught?" The Articles originally had this clause in the 29th, which corresponds to the present 28th: "Forasmuch as the trueth of man's nature requireth that the bodie of one and the self same manne cannot be at one time in diverse places, but must nedes be in some one certain place; Therefore the Bodie of Christ cannot bee presente at one time in many and diverse places. And because (as holie Scripture doeth teach) Christe was taken up into Heaven and there shall continue unto the ende of the worlde, a faithful manne ought not, either to believe or openlie to confesse the

reall and bodilie presence, (as thei terme it) of Christes Fleshe and Bloude in the Sacramente of the Lordes Supper.” And this clause is not in the present Article. But the omission of it amounts to no more than, that it was not thought necessary to retain it. One might, certainly, believe, if he thought he had sufficient reason to believe, that it is not against the truth of man’s nature, that the body of one and the self-same man should be in divers places at one time: and that the body of Christ may be at one time in many and divers places; but the Articles do not therefore teach the belief of either of these things. Possibly, indeed probably, they were intended not to exclude such as might believe them. But this we have nothing to do with here: the Articles were not intended to teach them: nor do they teach them.

Another change made in the Article, by the omission of words, was clearly made for the sole reason that it was not considered necessary to keep them. Originally the second paragraph of the Article was: “Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ’s body and blood”: but now in its present form the words: “into the substance of Christ’s body and blood” are omitted: plainly because they are necessarily to be understood in the words which are retained.

Passing on, then, from the changes which were made in the Article, we come to the consideration of it as it now is. “The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves, one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ’s death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.”

“These words of Holy Scripture in the Article must of course mean all which they do in Holy Scripture.”* Unquestionably: but what do they mean in Holy Scripture? Take the interpretation of St. Chrysostom here cited by Dr. Pusey: The apostle “intended to express something more [than the participation], and to point out how close was the union: in that we communicate, not only by participating, but also by

* The Real Presence, 198.

being united. For as that Body is united to Christ, so also we are united to Him by this Bread.”* Or take Dr. Pusey’s own interpretation: “He [the apostle] says ‘the bread,’ i. e. that bread over which Christ said the words, ‘This is my Body,’ ‘is a communion or partaking of *the Body of Christ.*’ ‘The Cup of blessing,’ i. e. the cup which Christ blessed, saying, ‘This is my Blood of the New Testament,’ ‘is the Communion, partaking of, *the Blood of Christ.*’ We become partakers of Christ, because we are partakers of His Body and Blood. ‘According both to the declaration of our Lord,’ says St. Hilary, ‘and our faith, it is truly Flesh and truly Blood. And these, received and drunk into us, cause that both we are in Christ, and Christ is in us.’”† “But ‘the bread’ would not be ‘the communion of the Body of Christ,’ unless, through it, that Body was conveyed to us.”‡

Observe, then, that neither Holy Scripture in this place, nor the Article, nor any of these interpretations, says that “the bread which we break is the communion or partaking of the body of Christ,” as it now is, that is, of his glorified body: but, on the contrary, they do say, that “the cup of blessing which we bless is the communion or partaking of the blood of Christ”; which could not be if the bread were the partaking of his glorified body. To speak of his body—and—blood,—if the words have any meaning,—is to deny, by necessary consequence, that it is his glorified or living body. In his living or glorified condition, the flesh and the blood form one undivided and indivisible body: and if the bread had in it or under its form this living body, it would have the flesh and the blood together in one indissolubly. But as the bread is not the cup, nor the cup the bread, and one is not contained in the other; so neither is the body of Christ his blood also, neither is his blood his body: neither is one united with or contained in the other: they are separate: and it is the dead, and not the glorified, body. And as the dead body cannot be present, and there is no promise of the presence of the glorified body, whatever be its capacities, no real presence of the body and blood of Christ can be proved in or with the elements, or under the form of the elements.

Observe also that what St. Hilary says is this: on the words, “He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent Me, and I

* Ibid.

† P. 200.

‡ 201.

live by the Father, so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me :” he says, “Of the truth of the Flesh and Blood there is no room left for doubt. For now, according both to the declaration of our Lord Himself, and our faith, it is truly Flesh and truly Blood. And these received and drunk into us, cause, that both we are in Christ, and Christ is in us.”* And it appears that if Hilary is speaking of the Eucharist, which, from the words, “received and drunk into us,” most probably is the case, the meaning plainly is, that it is truly the flesh of Christ, and truly his Blood, which we receive. But this would be no proof of “The Real Presence,” except it were first demonstrated, that, to use Dr. Pusey’s words, “they must be there in order that we may receive them.” And this demonstration is not given, nor can it be accomplished, until it shall be proved that Divine grace is subject to the laws of matter, which certainly cannot be received by us except it be really present. I believe that this cannot be proved. I believe that we can be most truly and really partakers of that very true and real body of Christ, and of that very true and real blood of Christ, which were given and shed for us more than eighteen hundred years ago, and which are not now, as given and shed, in the whole world above or in the earth beneath; which therefore cannot be really present in, or with, or under the elements, or their forms. I believe, therefore, that they do not need to be present: and the necessity of their presence cannot be proved or maintained without a virtual contradiction to actual and undeniable fact.

The Article, after an express rejection of Transubstantiation, goes on to say that “the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.” And truly, if they be given, there must be a giver; as, if taken, there must be a receiver. By whom, then, are they given? All must and will answer, “most certainly and chiefly, ‘Almighty God, by the ministry of his priests, in the celebration of his ordinance of the bread broken, which is the body of his dear Son given for us, and the cup of blessing, which is his blood shed for us.’”

And the giving is “only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.” So also is the taking and the eating. It cannot, therefore, be seen. Neither the giving, nor the taking, nor

* See the place in Dr. Pusey’s other work—*Doctrine of the Real Presence*, p. 395.

the eating, can be seen, and the body of Christ broken for us, and his blood shed for us, which are given, cannot be seen; for they are not. They "are given, taken, and eaten—only—after an heavenly and spiritual manner."

But—they are given truly, taken truly, eaten truly. The very true body and blood of Christ are truly given, taken, and eaten and drunk: not, however, after the manner of earthly things; and, therefore, not under the necessity of earthly things.

So "The Real Presence" is not taught in this Article.

That Bishop Geste, who was "the framer" of this part "of the Article," did not intend to "exclude the presence of Christ's body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof," by the insertion of the word "only," is unquestionably proved by a letter of the Bishop's, of which Dr. Pusey gives an authenticated copy. But the intentions of others engaged in the revision, who admitted the word, may have been different; and they may not have allowed the force which he attributed to it in his letter.

A great deal has been said on all sides, in the interpretation of our formularies, from the known opinions of those who were concerned in compiling or revising them. But they were not put forth as expressing the opinion of any, even the most eminent and influential, of the company charged with their compilation or revision, but as the judgment of all: and we are really not concerned, in any case, with the opinions of any of the individuals, if those opinions were not expressly endorsed by the whole body, and declared to be intended in the form of words which they propounded.

It is one of the singular marks of divine Providence in the Reformation of the Church of England, that the sins, and perverse and evil purposes, the mistakes and prejudices, the idiosyncrasies and erroneous and immature views, of many who were instrumental in promoting it, were so wonderfully overruled in the accomplishment of this great work, so far as it was accomplished. The Church of England is not to be called by the name of any, even the best and wisest, who were instrumental in reforming it. And if it be called, as it has been invidiously and in a false sense called, a Parliament

Church; its formularies were accepted and authorised by Parliament, not in the sense of any of those who compiled or revised them, but “in the true, usual, and literal meaning” of the words in which they are set forth.

The question, then, is not what Bishop Geste intended; but what the words in their true, usual, and literal meaning, do signify. And in this meaning, we find no expression or intimation of “The Real Presence” in the words that “the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.” “The Real Presence,” certainly, is not denied, but it is not taught.

We shall have to recur again to the Articles under another head; but here we have to pass on to

THE RUBRICS.

“The Black Rubric,” as it is sometimes called, at the end of “The Communion,” has these words: [By kneeling] “no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural Body to be at one time in more places than one.”

This Rubric, then, declares, 1. That “no adoration—ought to be done—unto any corporal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood”: 2. That “the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here”: and 3. That it is “against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one.”

On the first of these propositions it is represented that the place originally was: That no “adoration—ought to be done—to any real and essential presence there being of Christ’s natural flesh and blood”: and a great deal is made of the change of “corporal presence” for “real and essential presence.” Dr. Pusey says, that in the exceptions made by the Nonconformists at the Savoy conference, “it was proposed to

them [the Bishops] to deny ‘the *Real and Essential* Presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood, there being;’” and that it “was at first declined,” and when “again proposed,” “was again refused.”

I do not find, however, in the authorities to which Dr. Pusey refers, that any mention whatever was made of the Real Presence either by the Nonconformists or by the Bishops.

The Rubric had been affixed to the Communion Office “by King Edward on his own authority”: but “was struck out by the Divines who revised the Prayer Book on Elizabeth’s accession in 1559. On the restoration of Charles II. kneeling at the Holy Communion was one of the eight gravamina of the Nonconformist party; the requirement of it, as a condition of communicating, was afterwards alleged as *the* point of ‘sinfulness’ in the Liturgy, and was the subject of a day’s disputation. The Nonconformists especially desired, that ‘the Rubric in the Common Prayer Book, in 5 & 6 Edward VI., established by law,’ they say, ‘as much as any other part of the Common Prayer Book, may be restored for the vindicating of our Church in the matter of kneeling at the Sacrament (although the gesture be left indifferent).’”*

And the answer of the Bishops was: “The posture of kneeling best suits at the Communion as the most convenient, and so most decent for us, when we are to receive as it were from God’s hand the greatest of the seals of the kingdom of heaven. He that thinks he may do this sitting, let him remember the prophet Mal. Offer this to the prince, to receive his seal from his own hand sitting, see if he will accept of it. When the Church did stand at her prayers, the manner of receiving was ‘more adorantium,’ (S. Aug., Ps. xcvi., Cyril. Catech. Mystag. 5,) rather more than at prayers, since standing at prayer hath been generally left, and kneeling used instead of that (as the Church may vary in such indifferent things). Now to stand at Communion, when we kneel at prayers, were not decent, much less to sit, which was never the use of the best times.”†

And in another part of the same document, headed, “The Communion Service,” they say, referring to the above; “Concerning kneeling at the Sacrament we have given account already; only thus much we add, that we conceive it an error to say that the Scripture affirms the apostles to have received not kneeling. The posture of the paschal supper we know;

* The Real Presence, pp. 222, 223.

† Cardwell’s Conferences, p. 350.

but the institution of the holy Sacrament was after supper; and what posture was then used the Scripture is silent. The rub. at the end of the 1 Ed. C. that leaves kneeling, crossing, &c., indifferent, is meant only at such times as they are not prescribed or required. But at the Eucharist kneeling is expressly required in the rub. following.*

These are the authorities to which Dr. Pusey refers for his statement, with the addition of Collier,† who merely recites the second passage from the Answer of the Bishops to the exceptions made against the Communion Service.

No reference at all, then, was made either by the Nonconformists or by the Bishops, to the real presence. The sole question in the case was the sinfulness, or the lawfulness and decency, of kneeling at the Holy Communion. This was the "gravamen." We must therefore withhold assent to Dr. Pusey's opinion that "it was proposed to the Bishops to deny 'the Real and essential Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood there being;'" and that this proposal was once and "again refused." So far as appears, not a word was said about the real presence.

Whether there is any difference in the meaning of the two expressions, "the real and essential presence," and "the corporal presence," "of Christ's natural flesh and blood," it is unnecessary, and would be useless to discuss. For the question of the presence is conclusively decided by the declaration at the end of this Rubric, that "the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." For our Lord's natural body is his very true personal body, which was born of the Virgin, was crucified and rose again, which also is now glorified and sitting at the right hand of the Father. This is the body, the body of Christ glorified, of which the presence, "The Real Objective Presence," is alleged to be in or under the bread and wine. The Rubric calls it his "natural body," or his "natural flesh and blood:" and it is none the less his natural body because it is glorified. But the Rubric declares that this "natural body of Christ is in heaven," and that it is "not here" because

* Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 350, 354.

† Ecl. History, II. ix. 884, or Lond. Straker, 1841, viii. 437.

his true natural body could not be both in heaven and on earth at the same time.

But here it is said: "When they denied 'a corporal Presence of Christ's natural Body and Blood,' they must have meant to deny that our Lord's natural Body and Blood were there 'corporally,' i.e. after the manner of a body. This they denied, and this only. They did not deny 'the Presence of Christ's natural Body and Blood.'" This is perfectly amazing. "They did not deny the presence of Christ's natural Body and Blood," when they said that "the natural body and blood of Christ are in heaven, and not here"! Was this a denial, only and merely, that they "were there after the manner of a body"? and was it an implicit admission that they "were there," notwithstanding; that they "were there, not after the manner of a body"; which, of course, would mean that they were there "after the manner of a spirit"? If it is anything, it is an absolute denial that they were there at all:—they "are in heaven, and not here." Could such words, or would such words, be used by those who believed that "the natural body and blood of Christ" were there? that they were truly, really, and substantially present there, in or under the elements, or their forms? Impossible.

That a body can be present not "after the manner of a body," is an evident contradiction: at least, if "after the manner of a body" means, as it must be admitted, "bodily" or "corporal." For if a body be not bodily present, it is bodily absent: and for a body to be present and absent at the same time, is a contradiction and impossibility.

But it is still worse: for by saying that a body is present "not after the manner of a body," it must be meant that the body is present "after the manner of a spirit." And as this would be no gain, unless it were ascertained that a body, by being present "after the manner of a spirit," can be present not in one, but in many places at the same time: and as it is not the manner of a finite spirit to be present in more than one place at the same time: and the claim is, for a body to be present "after the manner of a spirit" in innumerable places at the same time: the claim comes to this, that a body by being present after the manner of a spirit, is present as a finite spirit cannot be; and not after, but contrary to, the manner of a spirit. It is, therefore, an absurdity.

Nay, it is to divest a finite body of its properties, and to invest it with the powers and capacities of the Infinite: for if a body, by a presence not “after the manner of a body,” but “after the manner of a spirit,” can be present in many thousand places upon earth, and in many millions of distinct Hosts; which this theory comes to: then a finite body, by a presence after the manner of a finite spirit, has powers which belong to the Infinite alone. So that, though our Lord’s body is in one place only at the same time, and is always bodily present only in one place; yet by a presence “not after the manner of a body,” but “after the manner of a spirit”: it has the powers of the Infinite, the powers of God, and therefore must be God: if this claim of a presence “not after the manner of a body” is to be allowed.

It may be noticed also that Dr. Pusey says: “This [to deny ‘the Presence of Christ’s natural Body and Blood’] would have been all one with denying ‘the Real and essential Presence.’” * Now, since the Rubric does deny “the Presence of Christ’s natural body and blood,”—for it says that “the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here,”—it follows, according to this, that the revisers of the Articles did deny also “the real and essential Presence.”

Another Rubric requires that, after all have communicated, “if any remain of the bread and wine which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest and such others of the Communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same.” And this may not appear to be inconsistent with the doctrine of “The Real Presence”: but it most certainly does not teach it, nor imply it: for mere decency requires that the elements which have been put to such a high and sacred use should be “reverently” disposed of. And I submit that the reverent eating of the bread and drinking of the wine is not “an index, whether the priest believes” in “The Real Presence,” or no: for he who believes that the bread has been made, and is, the body of Christ, and that the wine is his blood; cannot but reverently eat and drink them, although the Communion be ended: and although he do not believe “The Real Presence” of our Lord’s body and blood in or under them.

* P. 224.

Similar observations are to be made upon the last Rubric remaining for consideration. It directs that "When all have communicated, the Minister shall return to the Lord's Table, and reverently place upon it what remains of the consecrated elements, covering the same with a fine linen cloth." The fact of the elements having been consecrated by prayer and the word of Christ, and of having been thereby made his body and blood, is ample reason for this direction. But that the bread is the body of Christ, is one thing; that it should have the presence of his body in it, is quite another: and that the wine is the blood of Christ, is one thing; and that it should have the presence of his blood in it, is also another: and that the bread is the body of Christ, and that the wine is his blood, is one thing; and that the bread should have, and that the wine should have, respectively, the presence of his body—and blood—in it,—each having the presence of the same thing, is yet another. This is the doctrine of "The Real Presence;" and it clearly is not a necessary ground for the directions of this Rubric.

And now I readily "sum up the teaching of the Church of England" on this subject nearly in Dr. Pusey's own words. "She teaches, then, that 'Sacraments, ordained by Christ Himself,' are means 'whereby God doth work invisibly in us;'* that 'the outward and visible sign' in the Sacraments is 'a means whereby we receive, and a pledge to assure us' of, 'the inward part or thing signified,' or 'the inward and spiritual grace;'+ that 'the inward part or thing signified' in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is 'the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper;'+ that 'Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, hath given his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ to be our spiritual Food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament;'+ that this is 'a Divine thing to those who receive it worthily;'+ that, then 'we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us, we are one with Christ and Christ with us';§ that the 'bread' which is 'consecrated' with our Lord's words, 'This is my Body [which is given for you,' is the Body and] the Communion or partaking of the Body of Christ; that the Cup or wine, which is blessed or consecrated with his word, 'This is my Blood of the New

* Art. 25.

† Liturgy, 1st Exhort.

† Catechism.

§ Exhort. at the time of celebration.

Testament, [which is shed for you,' is the Blood of Christ, and] is 'to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same,' 'the Communion or partaking of the Blood of Christ; '* that, if we receive rightly, we 'so eat the Flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, that our sinful bodies are made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most Precious Blood; † we are made 'partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood; ‡ that God Himself 'vouchsafes to feed those who duly receive these holy mysteries, with the spiritual Food of the most Precious Body and Blood of His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; § that 'the Body and Blood of Christ,' which were 'given and shed for us,' 'taken, eaten,' and drunken by us, || (plainly if we persevere,) 'preserve our bodies and souls unto everlasting life.' ¶

I have somewhat shortened this summing up, chiefly by the omission of citations from the Homilies; because I cannot consent to place them in the same, or anything like the same, rank of authority, with the Prayer Book and Articles. That they "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine," I, of course, admit; but that we are bound by every word or expression, no one, it must be supposed, will venture to say. One of the places is in that of the Homily concerning the Sacrament: "Thus much must we be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent": which is interpreted by some to mean, "a true figure of a thing present." I have observed elsewhere upon this passage; and I cannot but think that a due consideration of it, with the words which follow it, ought to be sufficient to preclude this interpretation. The Homily goes on:—"but, as the Scripture saith, the Table of the Lord; the Bread and Cup of the Lord; the Memory of Christ; the Annunciation of His Death; yea, the Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation." Can anyone think that if it had been the doctrine of the writer, or the intention of the writer to teach, that there is a real presence of the body and blood of Christ in or under the elements, he could thus have refrained from declaring such a presence? He heaps up words to magnify the Sacrament, and the grace con-

* Prayer of Consecration, and Art. 28.

† Prayer of humble access.

‡ Prayer of Consecration.

§ Second Thanksgiving after Communion.

|| Art. 28.

¶ Form at delivery of the bread and wine.

veyed by it: and when he has come to the height of his praise, and must have spoken of "The Real Presence," if it had been his doctrine, or his intention to teach it, he comes no nearer to it than, "yea—the Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation, which, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, the very bond of our conjunction with Christ, is, through faith, wrought in the souls of the faithful." And let the remainder of the paragraph be read: "the salve of immortality, and sovereign preservative against death;—a deifical communion;—the sweet dainties of our Saviour, the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection;—the food of immortality, the healthful grace, and the conservatory to everlasting life:"—when the writer draws upon the ancient Fathers for these glowing words, and is plainly endeavouring to speak as highly as he could of the Sacrament; no unprejudiced person can think, but that if he believed in the doctrine of "The Real Presence," he would have crowned his praises of the Sacrament with it in the strongest words he could command.

The Homily's account, however, of the Sacrament may be fairly added to the more authoritative statements of the Prayer Book and Articles: but without the gloss, which, so inconsistently with the character of the passage, has been put on the words, "no untrue figure of a thing absent."

And then, what is the brief sum of all? but that the consecrated bread is the body, and the communion of the body, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that the consecrated wine is his blood, and the communion of his blood: that by these outer and visible signs or forms, the inward part or thing signified, the inward and spiritual grace, the body and blood of Christ, are communicated, so that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful: and that by this communion or participation, we enjoy exceeding great benefits? In the yet shorter words of our Lord Himself, all comes to this, that "the bread is his body which was given for us, and the wine is his blood, the blood of the New Testament, which was shed for us for the remission of sins." There is not a word in our formularies beyond or inconsistent with this.

And the conclusion, therefore, is that they do not teach the doctrine of "The Real Presence"; which so far from saying that the bread—is—the body of Christ, says that the bread has

the presence of his body in it ; and so far from saying that the wine is the blood of Christ, says that the wine has the presence of his blood in it ; nay, so far from saying that the bread is the body of Christ which was given for us, says that it has in it the presence of his body in its glorified state ; and so far from saying that the wine is his blood which was shed for us, says that it has in it the presence of his body in its glorified state also : for, though some may talk of the presence of his blood in the wine ; they cannot mean his blood shed from the body, without giving up the doctrine of "The Real Presence," since "The Real Presence" is asserted to be of our Lord's body in its present glorified state ; and its blood cannot be shed.

It will, perhaps, be said that the Church of England does not deny "The Real Presence" : but this is nothing to the purpose. She does not teach it : and if it were her belief, she would not have left a doctrine of such moment to be inferred by a very doubtful process from statements which at best do not necessarily mean it.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND CONTINUED.
MISUSE OF THE TERM REAL PRESENCE.

It has been stated that the term "Real Presence" may have three several distinct senses; namely, first, the presence of our Lord in his Divine nature, imparting the virtue of his human nature: secondly, his presence in his human nature, that is, the presence of his glorified body, and therefore of his soul, which is now inseparably united with it, and of his Divine nature: and thirdly, the presence of his body which was given for us, and of his blood which was shed for us. It has been understood and taken in one or other of these three senses, by different Churches, or by different parties or sections in the Church of England, or in the Church Catholic.

All, indeed, would acknowledge the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ in his Divine nature: and that it is a true and real presence: a presence where two or three are gathered together in his name; a presence with the members of his body; a presence with his ministers in their teaching of his commandments, and in the celebration of his ordinances; a presence also in his Sacraments; a presence to hear, to help, and to bless; a presence to give power and efficacy. This real presence, Holy Scripture teaches and promises; the ancient Fathers, the whole Church, the Church of England and her divines, unanimously profess. And more particularly and especially it is a presence, a real presence, in the Eucharist, to make us partakers of his body which was given for us, and of his blood which was shed for us for the remission of our sins. This all have from the first believed, and do now believe.

Again, the ancient Fathers, so far as they can be said to have thought of "a presence," believing the words of our Lord, "This is my body which is given for you, this is my blood which is shed for you for the remission of sins," would under-

stand a presence of his body and blood. They called the bread his body, and the wine his blood. They took them for that which He called and made them. They spoke not, indeed, of a "presence" in the matter: they took that which our Saviour ordained and gave; and they received by it that which they desired, and which He had promised. In this sense they had a real presence, a presence of the body and blood of Christ, though they did not thus speak.

And in this sense, the presence of our Lord's body which was given for us, and of his blood which was shed for us, some of our great divines have expressly acknowledged the real presence: and it is, in truth, virtually acknowledged by all who say that the bread—is—the body, and that the wine—is—the blood, of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to his own words, and to the sense in which He spoke them.

But in not one of the Fathers, and in not one of the divines of the Church of England, who have been brought to give evidence, have we found the doctrine of "The Real Presence," as it has in this generation been propounded amongst us. None of the Fathers knew the term even: and though some of our divines have used it, they have used it in a totally different sense from the doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence." In none of the Fathers, and in none of our divines, have we discovered the doctrine of "The Real Presence" of our Lord—Body, Soul, and Godhead—in, or with, the elements, or under their forms.

The Church of England, moreover, is ignorant of the term. She knows not the very name; and, as we have seen, teaches not this doctrine. She, and her most learned doctors, and the ancient Fathers, all teach that, after consecration, the bread—is—the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for us, and that the wine—is—his blood which was shed for us for the remission of sins; but they do not teach that the bread contains his body, or that the wine contains his blood:—that his body is present "in" the bread, or that his blood is present "in" the wine. They have not determined any mode whatever in which the bread and wine—are—the body and blood of Christ; being satisfied with our Lord's own words, and that He makes them good. They have not determined that any presence "there" is necessary of the inward part or thing signified, the inward and spiritual grace; for it is to the faithful it is

"given," and "the means whereby" they receive it "is faith." The Church of England has not set out in that course of rationalism which makes the body and blood of Christ present and contained, in the bread and wine: which determines that He, therefore, is present in them, the Lord Jesus Christ Himself in his glorified body, with his Soul and Godhead; that "whole Christ" is present in the bread and wine; and thus, making the very same presence in each of these elements, makes one kind unnecessary, leads to the disuse of the Cup, and overthrows the very Sacrament itself. For it does overthrow the Sacrament, if that which He called and made his body given and broken, be made his body living, his body and his blood in vital union: and if that which He called and made his blood poured out, be made, not his blood poured out, but his living body; his blood not shed, but circulating in his body. These things are done in the doctrine of "The Real Presence": and the Church of England is guiltless of them; although, in part expressly and in part virtually, it has of late been imputed with great confidence to her and to those who have best expounded her doctrines.

Seeing, then, that the Church of England has not recognised the term "Real Presence" in any of her formularies, and that she does not teach the doctrine which it was invented to express, and which it most properly does express: it was, as I have said, a great mistake, and it is a great misfortune, that any of our divines have ever retained it, though it be to express a doctrine which we have seen is so very different from that to which it properly belongs. There was no need of it: our Reformers protested against it as "new-fangled;" and they expressed the doctrine which they vindicated without its help.

It has, however, been chiefly, if not solely, used by such of our divines as have adopted it, to show on the one hand, that the Church of England looks for and receives the same thing as the Church of Rome, though in a different or an undefined way; and on the other hand, that our Church has no sympathy with the doctrine that the Sacrament is a bare sign. And certainly it is true that our Church teaches, that her communicants, who come with fitting dispositions, do receive the body and blood of Christ, as truly as the Church of Rome can profess to dispense them: but notwithstanding the eminence of those who have said that our only difference in the matter with the Church of Rome is in the manner of the presence; and who

have seemed to intimate that the Church of England and the Church of Rome dispense the selfsame gift; I conceive that there is a wide difference. For the doctrine of the Church of England is, that we receive "the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for us, and his blood which was shed for us": whereas the doctrine of the Church of Rome is, that her communicants receive "whole Christ." We, indeed, are partakers of Christ, by partaking of his body and blood: by communicating of his death we become partakers of his life. But the Church of Rome reverses this Divine order: and makes a new Sacrament of her own. It is not the Sacrament ordained by Christ: for He said not of the bread or the wine "This is I," or "This contains me," or "This has my presence in it": nor did He give the bread only, and say no more of it than, "This is my body." But He said, "This is my body which is given for you." Nor was this the whole Sacrament, for He took the cup also, and gave it, saying, "This is my blood which is shed for you." Whereas the doctrine of "The Real Presence" is as if He had not said and done that which He did say and do; and as if He had said and done quite another thing.

Nor, indeed, is the term "Real Presence" properly applied, in the sense in which some divines have used it in declaring Church of England doctrine. No one can imagine that our Lord's presence in his Divine nature can be anything but real: or that the presence of those things which He called and made his body and his blood, can be anything but real also. There is not any conceivable necessity for declaring the reality of the presence in either case. His presence as God is undeniable: and our own eyes attest the presence of those things of which He said "This is my body, This is my blood." To speak, therefore, of a "Real Presence" in either case, is to intimate inferentially another presence: though our divines are not shown to have had this in view; and it is proved by the investigation of their doctrine, that they had not. The real presence of our Lord properly means or expresses the real, actual, and substantial presence of his human as well as of his Divine nature: and infers the exclusion of what some maintain, a virtual presence of his human nature by virtue of its hypostatic union with the Divine. And the real presence of his body and blood expresses a presence beyond that of the outward signs, and in or with them: a presence which our Lord has neither taught nor promised, and which, as his body given and his blood shed are nowhere in the whole world, is impossible.

The term "Real Presence," then,—be it said with all due deference to great names,—is most incorrectly and improperly applied in any sense but the sense of those who profess, that our incarnate Lord Himself, God and man, is present in or with the elements, or under their forms.

And this is evident in the unfortunate consequences of the use of the term of which I have been speaking. For seeing that it has been used by such great authorities of our Church, some of late have caught at it; and hastily taking it in the only sense in which it can be properly or logically used, they have imagined that this was the sense intended; although a careful collation of each writer's sentiments would show, as we have seen, that the imagination is false: and thus they have themselves readily accepted the doctrine to which the term properly belongs, and have succeeded in imposing it upon others, as the genuine doctrine of the Church of England, and of her soundest divines.

That Christ our Lord, then, is present, and that his presence is real, to give us his flesh to eat, and his blood to drink: and that the things which He has made his body and blood are present, to make us partakers of that which they signify; and that this presence of his body and blood is a real presence: must be confessed by all. It is in one or both of these senses that the term "Real Presence" has been used by some of our best writers: but its proper meaning, which it was invented to express; to which, of right, it exclusively belongs; and in which, as we have seen, they have not used it; is not of our Lord only as God, and therefore virtually of his humanity; nor of his body given, and his blood shed as ministered by Him, and so by his ministers; but of his glorified body, with the powers of the Godhead communicated to it. Such a presence neither our Church nor her divines recognise.

The idea of a presence, is of that which we receive: for it is said that "it must be there in order that we may receive it." Several of our divines have said this: and it is evidently the corner stone of the doctrine of the nineteenth century. It is rightly believed that it is necessary to partake truly of the true body and blood of Christ: but it is falsely and wrongly thought that we cannot partake of them except they be present. Whereas that body,—that body which was given for us, is

not; and that blood,—that blood which was shed for us, is not: and, therefore, neither that body nor that blood can be present: but yet we can be partakers of them now, as truly and as effectually as if we had been present at the very moment, and as if his body were given and his blood were shed in our very sight. We could not then have eaten his body or drunk his blood in any other way than we can now. We could not have torn his flesh with our teeth, or drunk his blood with our mouths. We could not have received the flesh or the blood of Christ into our mouths and stomachs, without being partakers with his murderers, and incurring the guilt of abominable and inhuman cruelty. If we had been present with Him at the very moment of his yielding up his body, of its being slain, and of his blood being poured out; we could not have been partakers of his body and his blood in a higher degree, or in any other manner, than we can now. And now his body is no more in that condition of "being given," nor his blood in that condition of "being shed": but by faith we can be as really partakers of them now, as when his body was "being given," and his blood was "being shed": because "faith is the evidence of things not seen, the substance of things hoped for," and therefore also of things done even from the foundation of the world.*

To assume, then, that the presence of that which is promised to us in this holy Sacrament, is necessary in order that we may receive it, is utterly inconsistent with the very nature of the gift itself. The inward part or thing signified, the inward and spiritual grace, in this Sacrament, is not the body of Christ, but it is the body—and—blood of Christ. And for these we must go back in the remembrance of faith, eighteen hundred years, to the foot of the cross, at the moment when He yielded up his spirit; when his body was being given, and his blood poured out. To that moment so long ago, and to that land so distant, we must send back our faith: for at no time since, and in no other place, have that body in the condition of being given, and that blood in the condition of being shed, really existed, or been really present. And always and everywhere, since that time, the faithful have been, and to the end of time will be, partakers of that very true body given, and that very true blood shed, as really, and as truly, and as effectually, as if they had been present, and actual spectators at the

* Heb. xi. 1.

moment, and on the spot. None could, even then and there, have been partakers of the body and blood of Christ, but by faith. It was by faith only that the apostles received, at the institution, that which was not as yet, but was to be. It was by faith only they could have been partakers of that which was being accomplished even at the very instant and place when his body was being given and his blood was being shed. It is plainly by faith only that any ever since in any place could have been partakers of that which has been, but is not, that same body which was given, and that same blood which was shed. And by that faith alone it is, that, from first to last, so long as men need to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, they have been, are, and shall be, partakers of this most precious gift. It is neither in heaven, that we may ascend after it, nor anywhere upon earth or in the whole compass of creation, that we may search after it: nor in the deep, that we may go down to bring it up. It can be present only to the remembrance of faith; and can have no place but in the heart of them that believe. There, and there only, can be a presence, if any will speak of a presence, of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for us, and of his blood which was shed for us. And by partaking of them we dwell in Him, and He in us; we are one with Him, and He with us. By communicating in his death, we are partakers of his life,—partakers of Himself. We must not think of reversing the order laid down by Him: “He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.”

But it is of the greatest moment to observe, that the faith of which we speak, is a faith according to, and built upon, the word of Christ Himself. It is not independent of his ordinance, but operates in it. It is not faith which would say, “I can partake of the body and blood of Christ without the Sacrament, and therefore I have no need to communicate.” The connection between faith and the word of God is vital and inseparable. And the word of God in the case is this, which the Lord said, when He took bread, and brake it, and gave it:—“Take, eat, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me”: and when He took the cup, “Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: this do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me.” He made the eating of the bread to be the eating of his body, and the drinking of the

cup to be the drinking of his blood: or, as St. Paul puts it, "the bread which we break," He made to be "the communion or partaking of his body," and "the cup of blessing which we bless," He made to be "the communion or partaking of his blood." Faith, therefore, will seek the communion of the Lord's body by the breaking of the bread; and the communion of his blood, by the cup of blessing. It will not attempt to "put asunder" what He has "joined together." Certainly, even without the Sacrament, it will revolve the "passion of our Lord, and with delight and advantage, will lay up in memory that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us;"⁸⁴ and thus, in a manner, may be partaker of his body and blood: but this very faith, instead of being satisfied with this unseen and purely spiritual communion, will resort with all the more desire and devotion to that communion of his body and blood which He has ordained. As it is the means, and the only means, which He has ordained, by which we are to eat his flesh and drink his blood, faith will cleave to it with confidence in his promise; and with the firm assurance that it will be "meat indeed, and drink indeed;" seeing that He has said "This is my body which is given for you, This is my blood which is shed for you"; and, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day."

And here a distinction may be noticed, in that it has been said, that it is by faith only we are partakers of the body and blood of Christ; and that the holy Sacrament is the means appointed by Him to this end. Faith, therefore, and the Sacrament are both means, and the only means, each in their kind: the one subjective and the other objective, as it is now the fashion to speak. This Sacrament, or to speak with precision, "the outward part or sign" of the Sacrament, is the means, and the only "means whereby" "the inward part or thing signified," the body and blood of Christ, is given and communicated to us: and faith is the only means whereby we receive and eat the Lord's body, and receive and drink his blood. And the distinction shows the necessity of each of these means. We cannot receive the body and blood of Christ

⁸⁴ "Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere (Ioan. vi. 54): figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni dominicæ communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit."—S. August. De Doctrina Christiana, III. xvi.; Migne, III. 74, 75.

except they be given to us: they are given to us only in that way which was appointed by Himself: and they are given in vain, except the body be taken and eaten, and the blood be taken and drunken: and neither can be given or received without the means proper respectively to each action.

And if these be given to us, and we do receive, take, and eat, "the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for us"; and do receive, take, and drink "his blood which was shed for us": and these are not now: and yet we can be partakers of them in his appointed way, as really, truly, and effectually, as if we had been present at the moment and place of his death: then no presence, nor even existence at the present time, of that body which was given and that blood which was shed, is necessary, any more than possible, "in order that we may receive them."

It may please some to speak, nevertheless, of a "Sacramental presence": although the notion of any presence at all rests entirely upon that false and fallacious axiom, that the gift and grace of the Eucharist must be present, in order that we may receive them. But what does a Sacramental presence mean? Of course it must be supposed to mean that which is expressed by that other phrase, "a presence after the manner of a Sacrament;" a presence of "the inward and spiritual grace," "the inward part or thing signified"; a presence of it "there" and then, in or with "the outward part, sign, or form" of the Sacrament. So, in reference to the Eucharist, a Sacramental presence means, that the body and blood of Christ, being the inward part or thing signified, are present in, or with, or under, the form of the bread and wine, which are the outward part; and that this presence is such a presence as other Sacraments have of their spiritual grace with their outward form. But this last proposition is transparently and utterly false. Take the only other Sacrament ordained by Christ Himself, or take all the other rites reputed as Sacraments by the Church of Rome; there is not one in which the outward sign, whatever it be, or whatever it be said to be, is even said to have in it or with it or under its form, the presence of the grace alleged to belong to it. And, certainly, the "death unto sin, and new birth unto righteousness," which is the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism, cannot be imagined by any to be present in, or with, or under the form of the water. It is not

the manner of the Sacrament of Baptism, nor the manner of any of the so-called Sacraments, to have the inward and spiritual grace belonging to it present in the outward forms. There is no such thing, then, as "a Sacramental presence," or a "presence after the manner of a Sacrament," in the Sacrament of Baptism, or in those other rites: and therefore to infer "a Sacramental presence," or "a presence after the manner of a Sacrament," in the Eucharist, is to infer a conclusion without premisses, and to speak of a presence after no manner at all.

"The Real Presence," again, is very commonly called "a spiritual presence" by some divines of this century, to distinguish their doctrine from that of Rome. "There is a Real Presence," says Archdeacon Denison,—“not material, or as it is said, ‘corporal,’ but immaterial and spiritual—of the Body and Blood of Christ, in the consecrated Bread and Wine.”* The presence, then, cannot be of that which is not, but must be intended of that which is; the presence of our Lord’s glorified body. But how, then, about his blood? How can there be a real presence of his body—and—blood, by any presence of his glorified body? The assertion of the presence of his body and blood, by a presence of his glorified body, is contradictory to itself.

Admitting, moreover, for the moment, the possibility of the real presence of a material body, "after an immaterial and spiritual manner": this is not that of which our Lord speaks by the words, "This is my body which is given for you, This is my blood which is shed for you." The spiritual presence of his glorified body is no more a fulfilment of his words than would be its corporal presence. Whatever mode of presence of the glorified body may be imagined, it would not be the body given and the blood poured out; one separate, as by the very words they must be, from the other. And this is what our Lord’s words and action require.

But our Lord’s body is still human, and therefore still material, though spiritual and heavenly. "A body it still continueth, a body consubstantial with our bodies, a body of the same both nature and measure which it had on earth." † This is "The very, true, and natural body of Christ": his personal body, born of the Virgin, crucified, glorified. It is the same body, unchanged since He rose again and entered into

* Sermon ii. pp. 17, 18.

† Hooker, v. 54.

his glory: neither is any change to pass upon it. And He has no other body than this, of which it is written: "The Word was made flesh." He has not two bodies, one natural and the other spiritual: but one body, both natural and material, and yet spiritual and heavenly. This is the body of Christ, and this only, which the doctrine of the nineteenth century alleges to be present "under the form of bread and wine." But Archdeacon Denison says: "It is *not* true that 'the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ' are present in the Holy Eucharist, 'under the Form of Bread and Wine.'" But "it is true that his Body and Blood are REALLY PRESENT in the Holy Eucharist, 'under the Form of Bread and Wine'—i. e. PRESENT THINGS—though they be Present after a manner ineffable, incomprehensible by man, and not cognisable by the senses."* And he says in a note upon this: "The Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist is therefore not—as I believe it is very generally supposed to be—the presence of an *Influence* emanating from a *Thing absent*, but the invisible and supernatural *presence* of a *Thing present*; of his Body and his Blood Present, 'under the Form of Bread and Wine.'" If, then, our Lord's natural body be not present, his body is not present at all, for He has no body but his one natural body.

But "the body and blood of Christ," it is said, "are present after an immaterial and spiritual manner." Now, if it were demonstrated that a material body can be present anywhere, after the manner of an immaterial spirit: there would be these two insuperable difficulties in the case.—First, unless the body be changed into a spirit, in which case it would be no longer a body, it would have to remain absent after a material manner, and by the hypothesis it is present after an immaterial manner; and the absence and presence would be alike real. The same body would therefore be both absent from and present in the same place at the same time. And the same body would likewise really be in two places at the same time. Secondly, if a material body were proved to have the capacity of being present as a spirit, or after a spiritual manner, it would be to no purpose on the question before us, unless it had the capacity of being present at the same time in many thousand places: for this is what "The Real Presence of our Lord's body" amounts to. It is not a question merely whether it is present in heaven

* Sermon ii. pp. 80.

after a material and corporal manner, and also on earth after an immaterial and spiritual manner, but whether it is present in heaven and on earth in many thousand places and in many millions of Hosts at the same time. Our Lord's body must be, as Archdeacon Wilberforce expresses it, "The Body of God"; endued with the capacities of the Godhead, and liberated from the conditions of a finite nature: in one word, it must be God itself. The manhood would be swallowed up in the Godhead. And I need not say that this is manifest heresy.

The spiritual presence of a material body, is indeed, a real absence of the body; and the real spiritual presence, or the presence "after an immaterial and spiritual manner" of a material body is a contradiction in words and an impossibility in fact.

And, lastly, so impressed have been the minds of some with the necessity of some presence of that which we receive, "in order that we may receive it," that although disbelieving the "Real Presence" of the body and blood of Christ, either corporally or in a spiritual manner, they will have it that there is a virtual presence of his body and blood; that He being present in his Divine nature, imparts by it a virtual presence of his human nature. Taking the words of our Catechism that "the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper": they conceive that some virtue or energy from his body in heaven must be conveyed through his Divine nature and power, delivered to and received by the communicants, as being "verily and indeed" his body and blood. But Dr. Pusey rightly says: "Plainly not,—the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, as it is in Heaven, at the Right Hand of God; from which we have no direct influence; which does not in any way that has been revealed to us, 'preserve us': and "nowhere in Holy Scripture is any benefit spoken of, as derived directly from his body, except as received by us in the Holy Eucharist":—"apart from His gift of Himself, His Body and Blood, in the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, no benefit is spoken of in Holy Scripture, as issuing to us directly from the Body of Christ."* A virtue from his body now, would be from the glorified body, his body as it now is in heaven: it would not be his body which was

* The Real Presence, pp. 172, 173.

given for us, and his blood which was shed for us ; nor a virtue from his body and blood in those conditions. There can be no virtual presence of that which does not exist ; though it has present effects, and will have effect to all eternity in them that are saved by his death. But the virtual presence of his body as it now is, is not that of which our Lord spoke when He said, "This is my body which is given for you, This is my blood which is shed for you."

If any will call the presence of our Lord as God, or the presence of those things which He has called and made his body and blood, by the term Real Presence, let them remember that neither of these is "The Real Presence" of his body and his blood : the real presence, that is, of his glorified body in the bread and wine, or under their form : and that their use of the term in one sense, gives countenance and a sort of sanction for the use of the term in this very different sense.

CHAPTER XVIII.

WHAT THE WICKED RECEIVE IN THE HOLY COMMUNION.

It has been shown that, by the literal interpretation of our Lord's words in the institution of the Eucharist, the bread is his body which was given for us, and the wine is his blood which was shed for us, for the remission of sins : that they are his body and blood separately from each other : that He called the bread his body given, that is, sacrificed, dead ; and called the wine his blood poured out from the body : that his body is not now in the condition which the word "given" signifies, and his blood is not now in the condition which the word "shed" signifies : that his given body, and his poured-out blood, do not anywhere exist : that, therefore, there cannot be a presence, a real presence, of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, or in or with the bread and wine, or under their forms : that the body and blood of Christ, the body given, and the blood shed, the inward part of the Sacrament, were received by the apostles at the very hands of our Lord Himself only by faith ; that even at the very moment and place of his death, they could not have received the body and blood otherwise than by faith ; and that none ever since could receive them but by faith.

It might seem, therefore, unnecessary and fruitless to enter into the question whether they who are "void of lively faith" are or can be partakers of the Lord's body and blood, the inward and spiritual grace of the Sacrament. If there is not, nor can be, any real actual presence of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for us, and of his blood which was shed for us : and if faith is the only means whereby, in conjunction with this Sacrament, any from the very first could ever be partakers of this heavenly food : the question is clearly and finally decided, that those who are "void of faith," are not and cannot be partakers of it.

Nevertheless, very important distinctions are to be made.

The consecrated bread is the body of Christ which was given for us, and the wine is his blood which was shed for us. And the consecrated bread is not the body of Christ which was given for us, and the wine is not his blood which was shed for us.* These propositions, or rather these sets of propositions, though contradictory to each other in form, are not contradictory to each other in reality; because the predicates in one set of propositions are not identical with the predicates in the other. They are all perfectly true, and perfectly consistent with each other.

And so it is perfectly true that all communicants, all who receive the consecrated bread and wine, receive the body and blood of Christ; and that all communicants do not receive the body and blood of Christ. So far as the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ; so far all communicants do receive that body and blood: and, therefore, so far do they who are "void of lively faith" receive that body and blood. But so far only. In that sense in which the consecrated bread and wine are not the body and blood of Christ, the unfaithful do not receive them.

Again, the bread is the body of Christ given for us, and the wine is his blood shed for us: and as the bread and wine, the outward signs, are offered and given to all, whether faithful or unfaithful; so are the body and blood of Christ, the inward part or thing signified, equally offered and given to all. The Sacrament, perfect and complete with both parts, the outward and the inward, the sign and the thing signified, is administered to all: its inward part, its spiritual grace, is offered and given as fully to one as to another. To all, whether worthy or unworthy, the bread is the body of Christ; to all the wine is the blood of Christ, in all its fulness and reality.

But the offer and gift of a thing is not necessarily followed by acceptance. That a thing is offered and given, does not prove that it is accepted. A capacity of receiving, and the will to receive, must be shown, before it can be concluded that the thing offered and given, has been taken and accepted. But that capacity, and, by consequence, that will, are wanting in "such as be void of a lively faith." The body of Christ which was given, and his blood which was shed, the inward part of the Sacrament, do not now exist, neither have existed since He rose from the dead: and therefore they cannot be taken

* See Appendix X.

and accepted, but only by faith. There is no real presence of the thing signified. It is not contained in the elements, nor conveyed by them as by a physical channel. Nor is there any permanent union between the outward and inward parts of the Sacrament, from which the reception of the inward can be invariably concluded through the reception of the outward part. The thing signified is not, and therefore is not present; and neither is nor can be so joined with the sign, that he who receives the sign must receive the thing signified. As "he that cometh to God must believe that He is"; so he that comes to partake of the body and blood of Christ, must believe that He gave his body, and that his blood was shed, for the forgiveness of his sins. And with this faith he is, and with this faith only can he be, "verily and indeed" partaker of the body and blood of the Lord. Without this faith, a man can have no capacity to receive, no will to accept, that which by the Sacrament is offered and given to him.

It is not merely with the mouth that one can partake of the heavenly food. It is spiritual, and can be received only by the spirit: there must be the desire and will of the heart, the power and capacity of faith in the soul, in order that it may be received. As water may be poured upon a flint stone, and will not penetrate it; or as wine may be poured upon a closed bottle, and cannot enter it; so a man may be surrounded with all the influences of grace, and may have the body and blood of Christ offered and given to him; and yet he cannot receive them, if he has not faith.

But our Lord Himself gives us some clear instructions on this question. He says: "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.—He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him."* Now we know, that "the wicked and such as be void of a lively faith," do not dwell in Christ, that Christ does not dwell in them, and that they have not eternal life: and it necessarily follows that they are not of those who eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood. And again our Lord says: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."* But they who have "no life" are the wicked, that believe not: and they that believe not, eat not the flesh of Christ, and drink not his blood;

* John vi. 54, 56, 53.

or else they would have life in them. They do not believe, and therefore do not eat, and therefore have no life.

Now I do not argue from these places, "that the wicked cannot, in any way, eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood":* for I have said, that "so far as the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ, all communicants," and therefore the wicked, "do receive that body and blood," do eat that body and drink that blood. "But so far only." They eat and drink the signs, or as the Article says with St. Augustine, "they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ": but they do not receive the thing signified, although it is offered and given to them, and they are "in no wise partakers of Christ."

But Dr. Pusey replies, that "the argument, if true, would go farther than most of those who use it are prepared to follow. For it would follow, that no one ever perished, who ever, in his life, really received the Body and Blood of Christ. And since those who use this argument, mostly apply the words to any feeding upon Christ by faith, it would follow, according to them, that no one ever perished who had even once, at any moment in his life in which he was touched by the grace of God, spiritually fed upon Christ by faith. For immediately after the words, 'whoso eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood hath eternal life,' our Lord adds, 'and I will raise him up at the last day.' Our Lord speaks not of a present blessing only in this life, but of one also which is beyond this life; and of both He speaks in the same way. 'This is the Bread which cometh down from heaven, so that a man may eat thereof, and not die.' 'If any man eat of this bread, *he shall live for ever.*' 'As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he *shall live by me.*' 'He that eateth of this bread *shall live for ever.*' The Gift in the Holy Eucharist, union with our Lord Himself through His Body and Blood, is a present Gift, involving a future and further Gift, if we persevere, and aiding us to persevere."† Exactly so, and most true. But then the argument is not, that he that has eaten the flesh of Christ and has drunk his blood hath everlasting life: but it is, that "Whoso eateth" the "flesh, and drinketh" the "Blood" of Christ, "hath eternal life;" and Christ "will raise him up at the last day." There is no promise imagined here, nor is any promise argued from it, that he who has "ever, in his life,

* Dr. Pusey, *The Real Presence*, p. 299.

† *Ibid.* pp. 299, 300.

really received the Body and Blood of Christ," or who has "even once, at any moment in his life—spiritually fed upon Christ by faith," "ever perished." It is he that eateth, and drinketh, he that is eating and drinking, who hath eternal life; ὁ τρώγων—καὶ πίνων,—ἔχει. He that continues to eat and drink, and as long as he eats and drinks the flesh and blood of Christ; he it is, and not he who has once eaten and drunk, but has ceased to do this. And this, indeed, is implied in Dr. Pusey's own words, as cited above: "The Gift in the Holy Eucharist, union with our Lord Himself through his Body and Blood, is a present Gift, involving a future and further Gift,—if we persevere, and aiding us to persevere."

Nor does it turn the edge of the argument to say with Archdeacon Denison, that "Our Lord is plainly to be understood—as speaking not only of the mysterious GIFT to be communicated to man's nature in the Holy Eucharist, *but also of the BLESSED EFFECT of that GIFT to all those who should receive it believing on Him*": and that "His words in this place declare and pledge to the believing soul at once the 'Res Sacramenti,' and the 'Gratia,' or 'Virtus Sacramenti.'"* This is quite true: but it does not in the least affect the argument, or help to prove that they who do not believe, receive that gift as well as they who do believe.

"*The inward part or thing signified,*" together with its *blessed effect* upon the believer's nature in body and soul," is plainly declared in these words of Christ: but it is not at all in anyway to be inferred from them, that the unbeliever partakes of it.

And if "we go to St. Paul" to "learn—what the wicked receive," we find him "speaking directly of those who *do* profane that Gift, and that not by *any* kind of profanation, but by eating and drinking unworthily, *That*, of which our Lord says, 'Take, eat, this is my Body; Drink ye all of this, This is my Blood of the New Testament.' Of these he says, that 'they eat and drink their own damnation, not discerning the Lord's Body';" and we may also say, "Surely, that same Body of which our Lord says, 'Take, eat, This is my Body.'" Nor need we refuse assent to the words following: "Surely, then, the Body of our Lord, which they do not discern, is that body which they eat unworthily, and eating which profanely, they eat, not life, but death." †

* Sermon i. 38, 39.

† Dr. Pusey, *The Real Presence*, p. 306.

But all this is made clear from one or two very obvious considerations. The bread, though consecrated, is still bread; but it is the body of Christ: the consecrated wine is still wine; but it is the blood of Christ: and so the bread is and is not the body of Christ, and the wine is and is not the blood of Christ. And in the sense in which the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ, even they who eat and drink unworthily do partake of the body and blood of Christ. They profane it, and, in the words of the apostle, "are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." And the words of the apostle clearly intimate the distinction above made. He does not say, "Whosoever shall eat the body and drink the blood of the Lord, unworthily"; but he says, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." And as it was not his purpose to make light of the sin, or to lessen it; but rather to set before the Corinthians its full enormity: so, if he had conceived that they who ate and drank unworthily, did eat that body and blood of Christ, which the bread and wine are not; he would undoubtedly have said this plainly, in order that they might be sufficiently warned against so great a sin. But instead of saying "the body of the Lord," he says "this bread"; and instead of saying "the blood of the Lord," he says "this cup of the Lord." It seems to me that the apostle has plainly, and, if his words be carefully noted, most effectually, guarded against the notion, that the wicked do "verily and indeed" receive the body and blood of Christ. That they receive the Sacrament of them, or receive them "sacramentally," is sufficient to account for St. Paul's words declaring the greatness of their sin. But that they do more than receive them sacramentally; that they do "verily and indeed" receive the thing signified; that they eat the Lord's body in the sense in which the bread is not his body, and drink the Lord's blood in the sense in which the wine is not his blood; is absolutely inconsistent with those words: "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.—He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him."⁸⁵ That "flesh is meat

⁸⁵ Dr. Pusey has some remarks upon the dwelling of Christ in those who eat his flesh and drink his blood, which I cannot allow to pass without notice. He says: "I was myself long in suspense about these words, partly deferring to the apparent authority of S. Augustine, partly withheld by the difficulty which S. Augustine states, that the wicked cannot 'dwell in Christ, or Christ in them.' I thought and said, 'But Christ dwelleth not in the soul in which Satan dwelleth. Nor yet can the Body

indeed"; and that "blood is drink indeed"; the very food and sustenance of eternal life; ensuring it here and for ever: and that the wicked have not life is a sure proof that they have not received the body and blood.

The doctrine of the Church of England is in no respect different from these conclusions from Holy Scripture. It is, indeed, admitted that she "has not thought it needful to lay down as a matter of doctrine what it is which the wicked receive": though it is asserted that, "in different places, she speaks as if they received the *same thing*, as those, who 'rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive it'; only, since they receive it profanely, to their harm."*

And so, to a certain extent, she does speak: for all receive the same Sacrament: it is the same Sacrament to and for all. The outward signs are given to all: and all receive the bread which is the body of Christ given for us, and all receive the wine which is his blood shed for us. All receive the body and blood of Christ: and yet again all do not receive the body and blood of Christ: for these apparent contradictions, as the reader knows, are both true.

and Blood of Christ be present without Him; for where His Body is, there is He. It is the very test of the reprobate, that the Spirit of Christ dwelleth not in them; and if the Spirit of Christ is not in them, they are none of His.

"It did not occur to me, that Christ, although He could not dwell in their souls, could be present as their Judge. God is present in Hell. Now having seen more accurately, that S. Augustine does agree with that great body of Christian Fathers, who believe that the wicked do receive His Body and Blood, I have yielded my belief to what before seemed to me the plainest meaning of S. Paul's words, that the wicked, while they 'are in no ways partakers of Christ' Himself, yet receive within them, sacramentally, His Body and Blood, which they do not discern, nor discriminate."†

I do not quite see how the statement, that "Christ, although He could not dwell in their souls, could be present as their Judge," is intended to apply: whether as showing the fulfilment of his words, "dwelleth in me and I in him," He being present with them as their Judge, from their having eaten his flesh and drunk his blood: or whether, his being "present, as their Judge," is a proof of the presence of his body and blood, and that they have eaten his flesh and drunk his blood. I cannot see any other application than one or other of these ways. But the former, I suppose, could not be intended. It could not be meant that the presence of our Lord as Judge to punish, is a fulfilment of the promise of his dwelling in those who eat his flesh and drink his blood. But surely, his presence as Judge is very insufficient to prove the presence of his body and blood, and the participation of them "verily and indeed" by the wicked.

As for any apparent difference between St. Augustine and the "great body of Christian Fathers," or as for any inconsistency with himself, on the question, he will be found in perfect agreement with them and with himself, if it be remembered that the bread is and yet is not the body of Christ, and that the wine is and yet is not his blood: so that it is true, that all communicants do and do not receive the body and blood of Christ. The Fathers all believed the bread to be our Lord's body and the wine to be his blood; and in this sense they held that the wicked do receive that body and blood: but there is another sense in which they held that the wicked do not and could not receive them.

* Real Presence, pp. 307, 308.

† Real Presence, pp. 306, 307.

They are the same Sacraments, which, according to the 25th Article, "have a wholesome effect or operation in such as worthily receive" them; and have a contrary effect in those "that receive them unworthily": and for this cause the Church may well warn them that if they come without repentance, "the devil" may "enter into them, as he entered into Judas, and fill them full of all iniquities, and bring them to destruction, both of body and soul." So while "the benefit is great, if, with a true penitent heart, and lively faith, we receive that holy Sacrament:—so is the danger great if we receive the same unworthily." On the one hand, "we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his blood": on the other hand, "we are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour. We eat and drink our own damnation." The Church uses the most forcible words she could in this warning: but she does not use those more forcible words, "we carnally and unworthily eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood"; which, if it were her doctrine that the wicked do eat his flesh and drink his blood, in the sense of the doctrine of "The Real Presence," she would most certainly and plainly have said. But the utmost she says is that "we are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour," "if we receive the Sacrament unworthily": which words certainly do not prove "The Real Presence" of the body and blood of Christ, "under the forms of bread and wine," or that the unbelieving receive and partake of that heavenly food.

"The Real Presence" would be a most just cause for warning to the unbelieving, as Archdeacon Denison pleads,* lest they should find a curse and not a blessing in the Communion: but though it would be, as above intimated, the greatest conceivable cause, yet there is quite sufficient cause in the way which St. Paul has taken. He does not speak of "The Real Presence"; he does not even warn against eating the body and drinking the blood of the Lord unworthily; but against eating "this bread and" drinking "this cup of the Lord unworthily." And surely it cannot be supposed that he would have used such terms if he had believed "The Real Presence of our Lord's glorified body under the form of bread and wine"; not to speak of the incompatibility of such a presence with the notion of his body—and—blood. Neither the apostle, nor the Church after him, could have failed to deter unbelievers from

* Sermon ii. pp. 90, 91.

the Communion, by asserting that presence in the plainest and strongest terms, if he or the Church believed it. They would never have rested in an obscure and doubtful denunciation of the sin; but would have made them plainly understand that it was an outrage against the very Person and Majesty of the Lord of glory Himself.

To say more on the question, "What do the wicked receive in the Holy Communion," would be to argue the question of "The Real Presence" over again: for the one question depends entirely on the other. Archdeacon Denison is perfectly right in making the decision of the former question the crucial test for the latter: for they who believe "The Real Presence," must be considered to be logically bound also to believe that not "the faithful" only, but the unfaithful also, do "verily and indeed" receive the body and blood of the Lord, "present under the form of bread and wine"; that presence being said to be "permanent."

But since it is the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for us, and his blood which was shed for us, which both the Scriptures and the Church of England teach us are the inward part, or thing signified by the outward part of the Sacrament, and are its inward and spiritual grace: since his body given for us, and his blood shed for us, are not, and therefore cannot be present: since He said nothing of his glorified body, and has promised no presence of it in the Sacrament or under its forms; and therefore we have no ground for imagining its presence: since the body of our Lord given and his blood shed are not his glorified body; and the very terms, the glorified body, and the body given and blood shed, are as much opposed to each other as life and death: since that which does not exist and therefore cannot be present, cannot be received or partaken of but by faith: it follows that they who have not faith, are not "verily and indeed" partakers of the inward part, the inward and spiritual grace, of the Sacrament; they do not receive or partake of that body of Christ which the bread is not, or of that blood of Christ which the wine is not.

CHAPTER XIX.

ON EUCHARISTICAL ADORATION.

THE adoration of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist depends in the same way on the question of "The Real Presence." And here I have to remark on the way in which Mr. Keble has stated the question. He says that "our Lord's Person is to be adored as present in the Eucharist by a Real Presence of his Body and Blood:"⁸⁶ that is, that there is "a Real Presence" of our Lord's body and blood in the bread and wine, or under their form; that our Lord Himself therefore is present in his incarnate Person; and that therefore He is to be adored in the bread and wine, or under their form. Archdeacon Wilberforce states the case thus: "Though the mention of our Lord's Body and Blood implies the presence of His man's nature, yet by virtue of that personal union, whereby the manhood was taken into God, it involves the presence of His Godhead also."* Thus it is on the one hand argued, as has been seen, that the body and blood of Christ are really present, because his body having new powers imparted to it from its union with his Divine nature, and being "the body of God," can be really present in, or under the form of, bread and wine: on the other hand, the argument here runs the other way, that from the "Real Presence" of his body and blood, there is "a Real Presence" of his Person, the manhood and Godhead.

But in such arguments there is a total oblivion of the very terms that are used: "the body and blood of Christ." In the inveterate rationalism of our mind, it is assumed that we cannot

⁸⁶ On Eucharistical Adoration, Ed. 2, i. It is to be remarked, that the nineteenth century doctrine disallows the conversion of the substance of the elements, and maintains that it remains after consecration. But, according to Aquinas, this makes the Eucharistical adoration which that doctrine teaches, idolatry. He says, "It is opposed to the veneration of this Sacrament, if any created substance be there, which could not be adored with the adoration of Latria. *Contrariatur venerationi hujus sacramenti, si aliqua substantia creata esset ibi, quæ non posset adoratione Latriæ adorari.*"—III. lxxv. 2. c. Did he think that our Lord's body was not created?

* Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, iv. 1853, p. 90.

receive the body and blood of Christ, except they be present: it is felt that they cannot be present separately, the body given, and the blood shed, since "He dieth no more": that therefore they cannot be present but by the presence of his body as it now is: and thus his body and blood are virtually and implicitly taken for his body. His body and blood are taken to mean the selfsame thing. Whereas our Lord gave his body and his blood distinctly and separately from each other; and He ordained them so to be ministered. He took the bread and brake it, and gave it, saying, "This is my body which is given for you": and afterwards He took the cup, and gave it, saying, "This is my blood which is shed for you." His body and blood are not synonymous: they are not the same thing, though they belong to "his man's nature": nor do they comprise his whole "man's nature"; they do not include his human soul: and when his blood was shed, poured out from his body, when the one was separate from the other, the soul was gone; He had "yielded up the ghost": the body—and blood are not the body, the living body, of Christ. They are his body—and—blood, as He gave them, and in no other way.

It is by confounding these two things together, and taking them as meaning only one thing, the body of Christ, that people stumble at the very threshold of Eucharistic doctrine, and are led on, in the logic of rationalism, to a doctrine that is contradictory to the words and institution of Christ.

No Christian would hesitate to worship and adore our Lord Jesus Christ, wherever he might know or believe Him to be. All must believe that He is present at the celebration of the Eucharist, present as God, and virtually present as man; that He is present in all his ordinances, and especially in his Holy Supper: and all therefore are bound to adore Him so present. And, certainly, I cannot conceive how any, who believe his real presence in, or under the form of, bread and wine, can hesitate to adore Him in, or under the form of, those elements, and to direct their adoration to them as containing Him. If He is there, He claims as high honour, as absolute adoration, there, as can be given to Him anywhere else.

And if He is there, He is there both as God and man: and therefore there can be no question as to the honour due to Him in his human nature only. It is idle and too curious to discriminate the honour due to his human nature from the honour due to his Godhead. These natures are "joined together in

one Person, never to be divided": and in his humiliation upon earth He never rebuked or rejected the lowliest worship that was offered to Him: but received and blessed the offerer.

I must think, with Mr. Keble, that "The Person of Jesus Christ our Lord, wherever it is, is to be adored—to be honoured, acknowledged, sought unto, depended on, with all possible reverence, with the most entire and single-hearted devotion, incommunicable to any finite being—by all creatures whom He has brought to know Him." But that "Christ's Person is in the Holy Eucharist by the presence of His Body and Blood therein," so far from being "demonstrated by Dr. Pusey and others," is demonstrated to be contradictory to our Lord's own words and institution, to Scripture, to the doctrine of the Catholic Fathers, and to the doctrine of the Church of England. "From which,—follows, by direct inference that the Person of Christ is to be adored in" the "Sacrament," not—"as there present in a peculiar manner by the presence of His Body and Blood,"* but there really present as God, and virtually present as man.

The practice of "Eucharistical Adoration," by which is now meant exclusively, or chiefly, the adoration of "The Real Objective Presence" of our Lord, in his incarnate Person, his glorified body, both God and man, is, of course, founded upon a supposed Scriptural doctrine. But some secondary evidence is alleged from the Fathers and the Liturgies, to show that the practice is Catholic, and therefore Scriptural.

Mr. Keble assumes "The Real Presence" as "demonstrated": and that, therefore, Eucharistical adoration would be the practice from the first. But, he says, "If we found a consent of Fathers and Liturgies in prohibiting the worship of Christ's Person, present in the Eucharist by the presence of His Body and Blood, we durst not practise it; our reasoning from Scripture and the counsel of our own heart must give way.—But," he alleges, "the case stands far otherwise," and he appeals to "positive historical evidence sufficient to convince any fair mind that in the fourth century Christians did universally adore Christ so present,—such evidence as cannot be set aside without greatly damaging the witness of antiquity in regard both of the Creed and the Canon of Holy Scripture." †

In the consideration, however, of such evidence, the reader

* P. 57.

† Pp. 95, 96.

must bear in mind, as he must throughout the whole subject from beginning to end, that "The Real Presence" is not simply of Christ in the Sacrament, but of his glorified humanity, his glorified body, of Himself as man and as God, in, or under the form of, the bread and wine: and he must remember that the adoration intended is not simply of Christ, but of Christ, man and God, contained in the elements, or under their form: that He is to be adored in them.

The earliest evidence alleged by Mr. Keble, is that of "S. Cyril of Jerusalem" about the middle of the fourth century; and from him he cites these places: "After having partaken of the Body of Christ, approach also to the cup of His Blood, not stretching forth thine hand, but bending, and saying, in the way of adoration and religious ceremonial, *Amen*; be thou hallowed also by partaking of the Blood of Christ." "Regard not thou the Bread and Wine as merely such, for it is the Body and Blood of Christ, according to our Lord's declaration. And what if thy senses outwardly suggest the other? Yet let faith confirm thee; judge not of the matter by thy taste, but by the faith do thou assure thyself, without any manner of doubt, that He counteth thee worthy of the Body and Blood of Christ." And elsewhere: "Approaching, therefore, come not with thy wrists extended or thy fingers open, but make thy left hand as if a throne for thy right, which is on the eve of receiving the King. And having hollowed thy palm, receive the Body of Christ, saying after it, *Amen*."*

We may grant Mr. Keble's postulate, that this was a "tradition of the Mother Church of Christendom in the middle of the fourth century," that it was "a part of the rubric in so venerable a Church,"—"to receive with adoration:" but adoration of what or of whom? Adoration of Christ, certainly, present in the Sacrament; but there is nothing in these extracts from Cyril to intimate any idea of his presence in the elements; and therefore nothing to show that the adoration was paid to Him as contained in them. On the contrary, he says: "Regard not thou the bread and wine as merely such, for it is the body and blood of Christ, according to our Lord's declaration:" and that the bread and wine—are—the body and blood of Christ, is a very different proposition from that which affirms that the bread and wine contain the body and

* Pp. 96, 97.

blood of Christ, or that his body and blood are present "under the form of bread and wine." And not only this, but the extracts show that the body of Christ was administered and taken separately from his blood; which of itself is irreconcilable with the notion of the presence of his body as it now is, in, or under the form of, the bread and wine. Cyril would have the bread and wine not regarded "as merely such"; therefore he would have them regarded as bread and wine still; but more, he would have them regarded as the body and blood of Christ. With him the bread was both bread and the body of Christ, and the wine was both wine and the blood of Christ: a doctrine perfectly distinct from that of "The Real Presence" either in the Roman form of Transubstantiation, or in the Lutheran form of Consubstantiation, or in the form of the nineteenth century doctrine. It is not only distinct, indeed, but absolutely opposed to the doctrine which asserts "The Real Presence" of our Lord's glorified body in or with the bread and wine, or under their form: for this assertion that the body of Christ is in the bread, is a denial that the bread is the body: and the assertion of the glorified body is a denial of the body which was given.

One expression, however, in these extracts from Cyril calls for some remark. He says: "Make thy left hand as if a throne for thy right, which is on the eve of receiving the King." So St. James of Nisibis says similarly: "Receive the body and blood of Christ, and carefully guard thy mouth through which the King hath entered."* He also speaks of "eating of the Word of the Father." St. Augustine in like manner says: "We live by Him, eating Him, that is, receiving Him as that eternal life which of ourselves we had not." "This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven': that by eating Him we may live." "To us That is Christ which is placed on the Altar of God." "They ate the Bread, the Lord." "Christ was carried in His Own Hands, when commending His Own Body, He said, 'This is My Body.' For that Body He carried in His Own Hands."† And Sálvian says: "The Jews did eat manna, we, Christ; the Jews, the flesh of birds, we, the Body of God; the Jews, 'hoar-frost' from heaven, we, the God of heaven."‡

The bread, then, being the body of Christ, it is, in the language of these Fathers, Christ, the King, the Word of the

* Dr. Pusey, *Doctrine of the Real Presence*, pp. 370, 373.

† *Ibid.* pp. 513, 515, 519.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 700.

Father, the Lord, the body of God, the God of heaven. And this manner of speaking is explained in another place of St. Augustine: "How 'carried in his Own Hands'?" Because when He commended His Own Body and Blood, He took into His Hands That which the faithful know; and in a manner carried Himself, when He said, 'This is My Body.'"* "In a manner He carried Himself." So, in a manner, the bread is Christ, the Lord, the King.

And this consideration is quite sufficient to account for "the manner or way of adoration and religious ceremonial" with which the bread and wine were to be regarded and treated; without any imagination of a real presence in them.

Mr. Keble next cites a passage from St. Ambrose on that place in the ninety-ninth Psalm: "Worship at his footstool, for it is holy;" which St. Ambrose reads "Adore his footstool." And as it is written: "Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool"; he says that "by the earth is understood the Flesh of Christ, which, to this day, we adore in the Mysteries, and which the Apostles—did adore in the Lord Jesus. For Christ is not divided, but One; neither, when He is adored as the Son of God, is it denied that He was born of a Virgin. The Sacrament, then, of the Incarnation being adorable, and the Incarnation being the work of the Spirit,—doubtless the Holy Spirit also is to be adored, since He is adored who, as to His Flesh, is born of the Holy Ghost."† And Mr. Keble remarks on this as follows: "The Body present in the Eucharist is to be adored on the same ground which made it right for S. Mary Magdalen and the Apostles to adore our risen Lord; and it follows from the unity of His Person, that to refuse It adoration is to act as if Christ were divided, and not One."† Now by "the Body present in the Eucharist," Mr. Keble means "the body of our Lord present in the bread of the Eucharist." But this is not what Ambrose says. His words are: "The flesh of Christ, which, to this day, we adore in the Mysteries." And this adoration is rendered, because "Christ is not divided, but One." But to adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries, and to adore his body present in the Eucharist, in the bread, is not the same thing. The Flesh of Christ is adored, "when He is adored as the Son of God," because He "is not divided, but One." And when He is adored in the mysteries, his flesh is *ipso facto* adored.

* Ibid. p. 520.

† Pp. 99-101.

But nothing is here said by Ambrose of the presence of his flesh in the Eucharist,—in the bread, that is. He does not allude to this as the ground of the adoration: but he shows that adoration which is rendered to Christ, is adoration of his flesh, because “He is not divided, but One.” Nor are we at once to assume, that by “the Mysteries” is here meant the Eucharist, or the Eucharist only. The very title of one of Ambrose’s works, “On the Mysteries, or on those who are initiated in the Mysteries,” is sufficient to preclude this assumption.

St. Augustine on the same place in the Psalms says: “In hesitation I turn unto Christ, since I am herein seeking Himself; and I discover how the earth may be worshipped without impiety,—how His footstool may be worshipped without impiety. For He took upon Him earth from earth; because flesh is from earth, and He received flesh from the flesh of Mary. And because He walked here in very Flesh, and gave that very Flesh to us to eat for our salvation,—and no one eateth that Flesh unless he hath first worshipped,—we have found out in what sense such a footstool of our Lord may be worshipped; and not only that we sin not in worshipping it, but that we sin in not worshipping. But doth the flesh give life? Our Lord Himself, even when He was speaking in praise of this same Earth, said, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.* Therefore when thou bowest thyself down prostrate before the ‘earth,’ look not as if unto earth, but unto that Holy One whose footstool it is that thou dost worship; for thou dost worship it on His account: wherefore He hath added here also, *Fall down before His footstool, for He is holy.*”*

Augustine, then, like Ambrose, interprets the “footstool” of the flesh of Christ, and teaches that we should “sin in not worshipping it.” And in particular he says, “No one eateth that Flesh unless he hath first worshipped.” “Worshipped that Flesh,” we may grant to be his meaning. “No one eateth that Flesh, unless he hath first worshipped it.” But how worshipped? Plainly, by worshipping Christ, whose “footstool” it is. Augustine does not speak of a presence in the elements. If he had thought of a presence, so to speak, it would have been a presence of our Lord as God; not in the bread and wine, or under their form, but to his people, to his

* Mr. Keble, pp. 101, 102.

ministers, to his ordinances, to his mysteries: a presence in and to all. And the worship he taught was to be directed not to the earth, not to the earthly elements, but “unto that Holy One whose footstool it is that” they worshipped.

And it must be noticed, that Augustine says: “No one eateth that Flesh unless he hath first worshipped”: which implies that he has not eaten who has not worshipped. He who has not worshipped has not eaten. He who has not worshipped the flesh of Christ, by worshipping Christ, has not eaten that flesh. “The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith,” having not worshipped the flesh of Christ, by adoration of Him, have not eaten that flesh. They have not first worshipped, and therefore have not eaten it.

On these places of Ambrose and Augustine, with some similar places of other Fathers, Bishop Andrewes thus writes: “In [the words] *adoration of the Sacrament*, [the Cardinal] shamefully stumbles at the very threshold. *Of the Sacrament* he says, that is, *of Christ the Lord in the Sacrament, present in a wonderful and true manner*. Away with this. Who will grant him this? *Of the Sacrament, that is, of Christ in the Sacrament*. Nay, Christ Himself the substance of the Sacrament, in, and with the Sacrament;⁸⁷ out of, and without, the Sacrament, wheresoever He is, is to be adored. But the King [James] laid down that Christ truly *present* in the Sacrament, is truly also *to be adored*, the substance, namely, of the Sacrament; but not the Sacrament, *the earthly part*, namely, as Irenæus; *the visible*, as Augustine.—But *in the Mysteries also* we adore *the flesh of Christ*, with Ambrose: and not, *that*, but *Him who is worshipped upon the Altar*. For the Cardinal wrongly asks, *What is worshipped there*, when he ought to have said, *Who*. Whereas Nazianzen says *Him*, not *it*. *Nor do we eat the flesh, unless we have first worshipped*, with Augustine. And yet we do not at all adore the Sacrament.”*

Another place of St. Augustine is cited by Mr. Keble from his letter to Honoratus, commenting on the twenty-second Psalm: “All they that are rich upon earth, have eaten and

⁸⁷ That the Bishop did not believe the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, that is, in the bread and wine, is seen in these words as cited before: “Christ hath said, ‘This is my body,’ not ‘This is my body *in this mode*.’ Now about the object we are both agreed: all the controversy is about the *mode*. The ‘This is’ we firmly believe.” He knew and appreciated the difference between “This is” and “This contains.”

* Respons. ad Bellarmin. viii., Oxford, 1851, pp. 266, 267.

worshipped.' By 'the rich upon earth,' we are to understand the proud, if we were right before in understanding 'the poor' to mean the humble. . . For not without significance is the distinction made between them, in that having said before of the poor, *They shall eat and be satisfied*, here, on the contrary, *All the rich of the earth have eaten and worshipped*. For they, too, are brought to the Table of Christ, and receive of His Body and Blood; but they worship only,—they are not also satisfied, because they do not imitate Him. For although they feed on Him that is poor, they disdain to be poor.—But since God hath raised Him from the dead, and given Him the Name which is above every name, . . . they too, moved by the glory of His Name in the universal Church, come to the Table, eat *and adore*, but they are not satisfied, because they do not *hunger and thirst after righteousness*; for such *shall be filled*:—*though not satisfied, yet they adore.*"* Thus Augustine says that the rich—have "eaten and worshipped;" that they "eat and adore"; that they are "not satisfied, and yet adore." But he does not say, Whom or what they adore. Whereas "Eucharistical Adoration," as it is now taught, is not simply of our Lord, or of Him as present at the celebration of the Eucharist, but as really present in the bread and wine, or under their form: and of such adoration Augustine does not speak.

We come now to the following passage from Theodoret: "It is untrue that after consecration the mystical symbols depart out of their proper nature; remaining as they do in their former substance, and figure, and form, and being visible and tangible, just as they were before. But the inward sense perceives them as being simply what they have become, and so they are the object of faith, and *are adored*, as being those very things which they are believed to be."† According, then, to Theodoret, "the mystical symbols—are adored," a practice which I think Mr. Keble would not have sanctioned. And this adoration was given to "the mystical symbols," not as containing, or having in them the presence of, our Lord, or of his body and blood, but "as being"—as being, mark,—"those very things which they are believed to be." It certainly does not prove Mr. Keble's doctrine of "Eucharistical Adoration," unless I greatly mistake it, and unless it go much farther than I am willing to believe,—that "the mystical symbols" were "adored—as being those very things which they are believed to be."

* Mr. Keble, pp. 106, 107.

† Ibid. pp. 107, 108.

I pass over some remarks upon occurrences “three centuries after Theodoret’s time,” because they are too late for legitimate evidence in default of earlier: and I come to the ancient Liturgies, with respect to which Mr. Keble’s remarks, that they “are almost or altogether silent as to any worship of Christ’s Body and Blood after consecration;” that “we find in them neither any form of prayer addressed in special to His holy Humanity so present, nor any rubric enjoining adoration inward or outward”; and that there is an “absence of special prayer to our Lord sacramentally present in the Eucharist”: are all that need be noticed here. There is some special pleading to show that this fact “proves nothing against His being adored there”: but no proof can be elicited from it, “that the Bread and Wine being once consecrated, the Body and Blood were believed to be present as the Inward Part of the Sacrament,—and then and there were to be—adored.”* The fact that there is no proof of a negative, does not prove the positive.

And now, it may be asked, what is the rule or doctrine, of the Church of England on this question? Does she teach “The Real Objective Presence of our Lord’s glorified humanity,” his glorified body, with, of course, his Soul and his Godhead, in, or with, the bread and wine, or under their form: and does she consequently teach that He is to be adored in that bread and wine? I quite agree with Mr. Keble, “that—granting the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, Adoration is not only permitted, but enjoined by the Church of England in her Prayer Book”: but I cannot agree with the remark which follows, that “those who would prove that she prohibits the one, must first make out that she denies the other.” The onus of proof lies, clearly, the other way: for they who would prove that the Church of England enjoins adoration of “The Real Objective Presence,” “must first make out” that she teaches that presence: just as Mr. Keble himself had founded adoration upon it.

But “the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence” is not granted. It is not proved either by “her Catechism” or “her Communion Service,” as, I venture to think, has been demonstrated. And no one who really puts before him a clear expression of the doctrine of “The Real Presence,” such as I have

given in the preceding paragraph, can seriously pretend that he finds anything like it from one end of the Prayer Book to the other.

The doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence of our Lord's glorified humanity," of his body, his Soul, and his Godhead, in or with, or under the forms of, the bread and wine: must first be made out to be the doctrine of the Church of England, before it can be concluded that she either permits or enjoins adoration of "The Real Presence," or of Christ Himself thus present.

Adoration of Him present, but not thus present, she must be considered not only to permit, but to enjoin: and for a precept of such adoration, her Rubric, that the communicants shall be "all meekly kneeling," as it is afterwards explained "for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers," may be safely taken. And as Mr. Keble says: "in kneeling down to receive the Holy Communion, they are in fact kneeling to Him who is come to give Himself to them; kneeling to His Person;—as truly, verily, and indeed, as if they had been kneeling on Calvary itself, at the foot of the real Cross;"* because as God, He is as really present in the Communion, as upon the Cross. And it is as God, surely, and not as man, that He is to be worshipped. Human nature, though "without sin," is not a true object of worship: but the Godhead in one Person with that nature is.

Nor is any authority for "Eucharistical Adoration," as it is now taught, to be found in "the black Rubric." In its first authentic form, it was declared that by kneeling at the Communion, "it is not meant,—that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or to any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood." In its present form, it is declared that "no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood." And there is much discussion as to the import of the change of "Corporal Presence" for "real and essential presence": between which expressions, I confess, I see no real difference, unless a body can be really and essentially

* Pp. 129, 130.

present, without being bodily present. If a body be really present, it must be present: that body must be present itself: it must be present bodily, corporally. If it be not corporally present, it must be corporally absent, and not really present. If therefore, a body be said to be not corporally, but essentially or spiritually, present, this is to acknowledge a corporal and, therefore, a real absence of that body.

Waving, however, such discussions, the question here is, does this Admonition or Rubric teach, that Adoration is to be given to the glorified body, or the glorified humanity, of our Lord, as really present in or with, or under the form of, the bread and wine? It says that "no adoration is intended or ought to be done—unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood." This would seem to refuse adoration to "Christ's natural Flesh and Blood," wheresoever present; for it says "any Corporal Presence"; and has omitted the "there being" of the previous form, which had, "any real and essential presence there being." But while one form prohibits "adoration—unto any real and essential presence there being," and the other form prohibits "adoration—unto any Corporal Presence,—of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood": neither of these forms; nor the existing form, with all the concessions that may be made as to the difference between them, teaches that adoration is to be done unto "The Real Objective Presence of our Lord's glorified humanity" in or with, or under the form of, the bread and wine.

That the great divines and authorities of the Church of England practised and taught adoration to our Lord in the Holy Communion, is, of course, indisputable. It is a necessary result of their belief that He is the Son of God. But that they practised and taught adoration after a doctrine which they did not believe, a doctrine of this nineteenth century, clearly, does not follow. They believed our Lord Jesus Christ to be really present in the celebration of the Eucharist, with a presence which He promised, not with a presence which He did not promise. They believed Him to be present to give his flesh and his blood to his faithful people, to dwell in them and to take them to dwell in Him: but they were too acute in their logic, too sound in their philosophy, too Scriptural and Catholic in their doctrine, to believe in the presence of that which does not exist, or of that which is not promised; to pay adoration to that which is not, or to that in whose presence they could have no faith: the body of our Lord which was given, and his blood

which was shed: or the glorified body of our Lord, the blood being not shed; in the bread and wine, or with them, or under their form.

Before we take leave of Mr. Keble, I must notice an expression which is to be found in various forms in his book. He says, "that our Lord's Person is to be adored as present in the Eucharist by a Real Presence of His Body and Blood." And again: "the Person of Christ is to be adored in that Sacrament, as there present in a peculiar manner, by the presence of His Body and Blood."*

Our Lord's Person present by a real presence of his body and blood! Present by a presence! a presence by a presence! A strange and confused statement surely.

It seems to me that the chain of thought leading to it is this: first, a real presence of our Lord's body and blood is laid down as necessary to their being received: secondly, it is conceived that this real presence can only be by a presence of his body as it now is, living and glorified: thirdly, that this real presence of his glorified body involves a presence of his very incarnate Person, a presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, both God and man.

But it is amazing that the very mention of the blood does not at once preclude such a process of thought. The body and blood are not the same one thing: nor is the body and blood synonymous with body. The body—and—blood of Christ does not and cannot mean the body containing the blood: it is not a periphrasis for the body. And the body, given, separately, and the blood, shed, separately, both offered and received separately, are, still more clearly, not to be taken for the body and blood in one; one containing the other.

And as it is never imagined that the body and blood of Christ are now separate from each other, as He gave them; and it is implicitly acknowledged in the different theories of "The Real Presence," that they now are not: so it might at once be clearly seen that they cannot be made present by his body in a totally different condition. The body given is not the body living: nor is the blood shed, the blood that is not shed. The body given and the blood poured out from it cannot be made present by the living body with its blood not

* Pp. v. 57.

poured out from it, but all of it circulating in the body and animating it.

True it is the same body which was given and is now alive and glorified. But as Bishop Andrewes said, "This is not it." Our Lord ministered his body given, as given, and his blood shed, as shed: and commanded them so to be ministered always. And the glorified body is not the body as given: and the blood shed is not given at all with it.

Indeed, as I have before intimated, this theory of the glorified body is in manifold contradiction to our Lord's ordinance and words. He says "This is my body": this theory says, "No, it is not his body, but it contains it": He says, "This is my body which is given for you": this theory says, "No, it contains his glorified body": He says, "This is my blood"; this theory is "bloodless" and says, "No, it contains his blood and his body": He says, "This is my blood which is shed for you": this theory says, "No, it contains his body and his blood in one, and the blood is not shed": He says, "This is my body which is given for you, This is my blood which is shed for you": this theory says, "No, this is not and cannot be; but the bread and the wine both contain the presence of his glorified humanity, the presence of Himself in his very Person, both God and man."

Archdeacon Wilberforce has similar statements. He says that "in the Holy Eucharist He is present—by His Body and Blood": and again: "Christ is really present because of the presence of His *Body*."

I cannot find that Dr. Pusey uses such a form of expression: but, strange and uncouth as it is, it really fits the doctrine he defends with so much piety, zeal, and learning.

This statement of a presence of our Lord by the presence of his body and blood, is as serious an "instance of over-explaining" as that of Hooker, upon which Mr. Keble justly animadverts. Hooker says: "My Body, the Communion of my Body: my Blood, the Communion of my Blood.—The Bread and Cup are His Body and Blood because they are causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the *participation* of His Body and Blood ensueth. For that which produceth any certain effect is not vainly nor improperly said to be that very effect whereunto it tendeth. Every cause is in the effect which groweth from it." Now seeing that Hooker cites St. Paul's words, "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of

Christ? the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" it cannot be this to which Mr. Keble alludes. The allusion must be to the assertion that "every cause is in the effect which groweth from it": which whether it be true or false in philosophy, can hardly work "harm" in doctrine. Whereas this doctrine of a presence by a presence is, as has been shown above, unscriptural, and full of "harm," much more serious than could result from Hooker's philosophy.

CHAPTER XX.

ON COMMUNION IN ONE KIND, AND ADMINISTERING BOTH KINDS
TOGETHER.

IN the study of Eucharistic doctrine, the words of the institution and the circumstances in which they were spoken; what our Lord said and did, and how He said and did it; must be kept continually fresh in the mind. The reader must carry all this along with him; or else some error will beset him.

If he forget that our Lord took bread, and said of it, "This is my body which is given for you": and that He took wine, and said of it, "This is my blood which is shed for you": or that He gave them separately, and when his body was not given, and his blood was not shed: and that it is his body which was given for us, and his blood which was shed for us, that we now receive: he will inevitably wander far away from sound doctrine.

If these things had been remembered as they ought to be, the Church would never have been outraged as it has been by a denial of the cup. But shutting her eyes against all but the words "Hoc est corpus meum," "This is my body;" and persuading herself that it is whole Christ, which we receive in the bread or its species, and in the wine or its species; the Church of Rome has in strict logical consequence, determined that her communicants receive in one kind all that they can receive in both, that therefore one kind only, the bread or the cup, is unnecessary for the communicants; and that the cup should be denied to them, for various reasons special to itself.

That Church, indeed, requires both kinds, the bread and wine to be consecrated, and to be received by the officiating Priest, as necessary for the sacrifice, of which we are to speak in another place: but she withholds the cup from all but him: and consequently neither any of the clergy under the order of the priesthood, nor any of the people, ever receive it. This is the prescribed practice of the Church of Rome; and it is one of the

things in which she differs from the rest of Christendom, and displays her uncatholic spirit.

The denial of the cup to the laity, as the practice in question is commonly, though rather inaccurately, called,—for it is in fact, as I have intimated, a denial of it to all present at the time of celebration, but the officiating Priest, and is therefore more properly called Communion under one kind,—is an innovation of comparatively modern times. It has its foundation in the doctrine of “The Real Presence,” and therefore was not thought of before that doctrine was enforced. Cases, indeed, there have been in early times, in which it appears, that from sickness, sudden disability, or other causes, the Sacrament was not received in both kinds: but all such cases were exceptions to the general rule. Sometimes, too, people used to carry away with them part of that which they had received in the Church, so that if hindered from communion there subsequently, they might, as they thought, enjoy communion with Christ at home. But it is not quite clear that they carried away with them one kind only, the bread: and, at all events, the practice, so far as it went, would be a precedent not for communion in one kind, but for reservation of the Sacramental elements.

It is needless, therefore, to speak of such cases, further than to caution the enquirer against the abuse, which is sometimes made of them by the advocates of the Roman practice; who, from a particular premiss, would draw a general conclusion; and from a private and accidental exception, would prove a public and deliberate custom.⁸⁹

⁸⁹ Take the following for an example. “St. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, about the year 247, in his letter to the Roman pontiff Fabianus, relates that a certain old man, called Serapion, when at the point of death, despatched a youth for the priest, who, happening also to be confined to his bed by sickness, sent to the dying Serapion a particle of the blessed Eucharist by the messenger, whom he directed first to moisten the Sacrament with a little water, and then put it into the mouth of the old man, who expired just after receiving the holy communion.”—Rock’s Hierurgia, citing Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. xlv. Now, in the first place, this occurrence is not correctly stated. Serapion had lapsed in a former persecution, that is, had denied Christ, and sacrificed to idols: “and at his death desired the Eucharist to be given as a token of peace and communion with the Church; which was a favour then thought fit to be granted to penitents.—The priest, rather than he should want this comfort, sent him . . . a small portion of the Eucharist, bidding the young man to moisten it, . . . and so to put it into the mouth of the old man.” In the second place, it does not appear that the priest “sent only the bread, or what was solid, or that a little of the Sacrament *βραχὺ τῆς εὐχαριστίας*) which is the thing he is said to send,” signifies the bread only.—Justin Martyr calls both kinds *τροφή*.—“And why not give the messenger a little wine as well as a little bread? And why may we not suppose that the liquor was to moisten the bread in, was the wine? and not, as Valesius [and Dr. Rock] without any grounds, put in his translation, water?—It is a strange thing and unheard of in antiquity, to mix the Eucharistic bread with mere water, and so take it infused in water without any wine” (Gibson’s Tracts against Popery, Tit. VII. iii.

It might, for example, happen to any priest of the Church of England, in the Communion of the sick, that the patient should be unable to swallow the bread, or to bear the smell or taste of the wine, even though it were mixed with water. If, then, in such a case, from private opinion or feeling, and from want of a distinct knowledge of the mind of the Church, either the wine without the bread, or the bread without the wine, or the bread moistened with the wine were administered; we should think the man a sanguine and not very trustworthy disputant, who from a few such instances of heedlessness or ignorance, should attempt to prove, that communion in one kind was a recognised custom of our Church. Or if, again, the patient, having received the bread, should become insensible, or should die, before receiving the cup; the impossibility of receiving the cup in such a case, can be but a slight authority on which an argument for *refusing* it in *all* cases is to be built. And yet of such a character as these, are the instances relied upon by the controversialists of Rome. The student will find the most made of them on the one side, and a full discussion of them on the other, in the second article of Bishop Jewel's controversy with Harding.

When, therefore, I say, that communion in one kind only is an innovation of comparatively modern times, I speak with reference to the public and authorised ministration of the Sacrament. The history of it is not a little curious: for the first who are recorded to have practised communion in one kind, were the Manichæans, who objected to all use of wine. Some of these heretics, in the fifth century, having insinuated themselves into the assemblies of the faithful at Rome, had partaken of the bread, but avoided the wine, in the Lord's Supper. This irregularity attracted notice; and the Bishop, Leo the Great, denounced the sacrilege, and directed the priests

p. 125). Justin Martyr also says that in the celebration of the Communion, "the deacons give to each of those who are present to participate of the consecrated bread and wine, and water, and carry them to those who are not present."—Apolog. I. 66.

The case of Gorgonia, sister of Gregory Nazianzen, who was said to have "always kept the body of the Lord—the blessed sacrament—in her chamber" (Rock, 199), can prove nothing as to the ministration of the sacrament. It is merely an instance of reservation.

Irregularities which occurred, as in the communion of infants, and of persons at the point of death, are clearly a very insufficient sanction with regard to the solemn ministration of the Sacrament. Infants could not take the bread, and therefore they had the wine given to them. Dying persons might have received the bread and expired before they could receive the wine: or the minister on his own judgment might have waived the bread as too difficult to swallow, and have given only the wine. What was done by individuals under supposed necessity, is no sanction for the Church when there is no necessity.

to drive those who were guilty of it, from the fellowship of the saints.⁸⁹

But the impious practice was still continued, insomuch that about fifty years afterwards, Gelasius denounced it in still stronger terms, requiring that communicants should either receive in both kinds, or be repelled altogether, and declaring that it was a great sacrilege to divide the mystery.⁹⁰

The conduct of the Manichæans was an exception to the universal custom of the Church; for if members of the Church had been permitted to decline the cup, the Manichæans would not have excited attention if they had done as others did. Nor is it to be maintained, that when a division of the Sacrament by receiving it in one kind only, was condemned as “a sacrilegious simulation” and “a great or monstrous sacrilege,” the faithful of the Church would be denied the Sacrament in its integrity and fulness; or that they would have been permitted to do openly what the Manichæans attempted by evasion.⁹¹

In the course of time, however, it appears that the Eucharist

⁸⁹ “Cumque ad tegendum infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant: ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt; sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut vobis hujuscemodi homines et his manifestentur indicis, et quorum deprehensa fuerit sacrilega simulatio, notati et prodi a sanctorum societate sacerdotali auctoritate pellantur.”—Op. Lut. 1623, Serm. iv. De Quadrag. col. 108.

⁹⁰ “Comperimus autem, quod quidam sumpta tantum . . . corporis sancti portione, a calice sacrati cruoris abstinent. Qui proculdubio . . . aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur; quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest pervenire.”—Gelas. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624; Deeret. Gratian. Dec. 3, De Consecr. ii. 12, col. 1918.

⁹¹ Bishop Chr. Wordsworth notices a remarkable perversion of this Canon of Gelasius. The Dublin Review had said, that “the Canon forbids the *priest* to abstain from receiving the cup, and that abstinence it calls ‘a great sacrilege.’ It is the *celebrant* the Canon condemns, not the lay-communicant; and the rule of the Church is no more condemned by it than it is by the statute of mortmain or the reform bill.” But the Bishop directs attention to the words of Gelasius, who does not speak of priests, but of “certain persons,” as being guilty. It was not the *celebrant*, but the communicants, that the words point to: and it would be a very strange way of remedying the irregularity of a celebrating priest abstaining from the cup, to order him to drive himself away from the communion.—See Wordsworth’s Sequel to Letters to Mr. Gordon, p. 127.

“And when to conceal their infidelity they dare to be present at our mysteries, they so manage in the communion of the sacraments, as sometimes to be more safely hid: with unworthy mouth they receive the body of Christ; but altogether decline to drink the blood of our redemption. Which therefore we desire your holiness to know, that men of this kind both may be discovered to you by these marks, and that those whose sacrilegious simulation shall be found out, may be marked, exposed, and driven by sacerdotal authority from the society of the saints.”

“We have found, too, that some having received only the portion of the holy body, abstain from the cup of the consecrated blood. Who beyond doubt . . . must either take the whole sacrament, or be driven from it altogether; because a division of one and the same mystery cannot come without great sacrilege.”

was sometimes administered publicly with small pipes in the chalice, and sometimes privately and in special cases, by dipping the bread in the wine, and giving both thus together: and as this latter mode of administering began to be adopted in some places, decrees were made to check it. The Council of Tours in the sixth century had, indeed, decreed that "the Eucharist should be given to the sick dipped in the Lord's blood, in order that the Priest should be able to say, 'The body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.'" ⁹² But this was disannulled not long after by the Council of Bracara, which decreed that "The bread was not to be given to the people dipped in the blood, because the Lord gave each species apart, that is, first the species of bread, afterwards the species of wine." ⁹³ And another canon recites, that the Council was "given to understand that some persons present unto the people, as a perfect communion, the Eucharist steeped.—And whereas they give this as a perfect communion, the example of the Scripture which is alleged, where Jesus Christ recommended His body and blood unto His Apostles, will not admit of it: for it is said, that He bid them take His body apart, and His blood apart. And we do not read that Jesus Christ gave the steeped bread unto any but the disciple, which should be known to be him, to whom it was given, even him that would betray his Master, and not to shew the institution of the Sacrament."*

In the 10th century this practice seems to have again begun to creep in on a plea of necessity, "for fear," as it was said, "of shedding the blood of Christ." And again, in the end of the 11th century another decree was made by a Council under Pope Urban II., ordering that "no person should presume to communicate at the Altar without receiving the body apart, and also the blood by itself, unless it be by necessity and with precaution." † And his successor, Paschal II., just at the end of the 11th century, "commanded both Symbols to be distributed separately, except it be unto young children, and such as are at the point of death; for unto such, he gives liberty that they should be communicated with the holy—wine—only, because they cannot swallow down the bread." ‡

⁹² "Dandam ægrotis Eucharistiam intinctam sanguine Domini, ut Presbyter vere dicere possit, Corpus et sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi."—Hospin. Hist. Sac. I. 187.

⁹³ "Non esse dandum populo panem intinctum in sanguine, quod Dominus dederit utramque speciem seorsim, id est, primo speciem panis, postea speciem vini."—Ibid.

* See Appendix Y.

See L'Arroque, 138, who refers to Baronius' *Ecl. An. xi. A.D. 1095.*
L'Arroque, p. 139.

This practice, however, gained ground, notwithstanding successive prohibitions and checks: and if not common, was at least very frequent in the 12th century in the Western Church: the cup, indeed, being imparted separately to "the most considerable," and to such as would "know how to yield thereunto the greater reverence and caution," especially "the priests and ministers of the altar."

The administration of the sopped bread proved, as it has been remarked, "how necessary both symbols were believed to be, to make a lawful communion." Yet it would naturally pave the way for the total disuse of the cup.* The bread being dipped into the wine, and permitted to absorb less and less, it would at length by very easy steps, come to be administered without any of the wine. One unauthorised innovation necessarily opens the door for others; especially if the innovation be the effect of false doctrine.

The main incentive to communion in one kind, was the tendency of opinion towards the doctrine of Transubstantiation: and in proportion as this doctrine was received, and the wine was thought to be changed into the natural blood of Christ, a feeling of repugnance and superstitious dread would be engendered in the minds of ill-instructed Christians. But though communion in one kind was a natural result of Transubstantiation, it was not till the beginning of the 15th century, and two hundred years after that doctrine was set forth by the Church, that the decree, forbidding the cup, was made. It was declared by the Council of Constance, that "although Christ . . . administered this holy Sacrament to his disciples in both kinds of bread and wine; . . . and although this Sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds in the primitive Church; it was afterwards received under both kinds by the officiating priests only, and by the people under the species of bread only: it being believed most certainly, and nothing doubted, that the entire body and blood of Christ are really contained under the species of bread, as of wine." † This practice, therefore, was approved and made a law by the Council to be relaxed or changed only by the authority of the Church.

In the exercise of this authority, the cup was allowed to the Bohemians: ‡ and at the feast of Easter, the Bishop of Rome §

* See Appendix Z.

‡ Appendix B B.

† Appendix A A.

§ Appendix C C.

is said to have continued, for some time, to "permit" the Deacons, the ministers of the altar, and other persons eminent in piety and worth, and also rectors of places, and considerable monasteries, his brethren, and others whom he thought worthy of so great a gift, to receive under both kinds of bread and wine. A century and a half later, the Council of Trent made a similar decree, and enforced it by the severest penalties. It was, however, still left to the discretion of the Pope, to allow communion in both kinds to any nation or kingdom, as he might judge to be useful or necessary to salvation.

Thus did Rome make herself an exception in this vital matter to all the rest of Christendom, and presume to forbid that, which all other Churches agreed in acknowledging, that the Lord had commanded to be done, and that the Church must do.

And now, it will be enquired, on what grounds and for what reasons did the Church of Rome thus decree? The doctrine of "The Real Presence," then, is the ground of the decree; and such things as a fear of "spilling the blood," or of a communicant's beard dipping into it, are the reasons alleged, under the pretence of "scandals and dangers," for its enactment.

The doctrine of "The Real Presence," as it is propounded by the Church of Rome, determines it to be "most true that just as much is contained under either species as under each: for that Christ, whole and entire, is under the species of bread, and under any part soever of that species; whole also under the species of wine, and under its parts."* From which it follows, that no communicant need receive more than one kind, the bread or the wine: since in either he receives the same, and just as much, as he would receive under both. The matter thus seems to be brought within the discipline and the dispensing power of the Church: and she has not hesitated or scrupled to abolish communion in the "cup of blessing"; pretending the authority even of our Lord Himself, and of his apostle St. Paul. A few words therefore must be devoted to a consideration of the passages in which it is alleged that this authority is found.

"In the sixth chapter of St. John," says Dr. Rock, "where the mystery of the Holy Eucharist is promised, not only is there made a separate mention of eating, but precisely the same promises of future life, which are announced to those who both eat and drink, are also given to such as eat only;—'If any

* Concil. Trid. sess. 13, can. 3.

man,' says our divine Redeemer, 'eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give, is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world.' 'He that eateth me, the same also shall live by me.' 'He that eateth this bread shall live for ever.'" And "St. Paul, in speaking of the Eucharist, represents it under one kind only, for he says;— 'Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.'"*

It might, indeed, follow from our Lord's words here cited, that it would be sufficient to partake of his body, and therefore, of the bread, only, if He had said nothing more: but this conclusion is stopped by those other words in which He in a measure explained what He had before said: "Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day: for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat the manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."† "This is that bread," He said. "This" what? Clearly, his "flesh" which "is meat indeed," and his "blood" which "is drink indeed": for this is the only antecedent to which the demonstrative pronoun can refer. And it is his blood no less than his flesh, of which He says "This is that bread": and whereas He had said: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man,—and—drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh,—and—drinketh my blood, hath eternal life": it is beyond all question, that we must drink his blood, as well as eat his flesh, if we would have life in us, and have the promise of life "for ever." And then, since the bread in the Eucharist is the body of Christ, and the wine is his blood, we must partake of the wine as well as of the bread; of one as well as of the other. He joined both together, the bread and the wine, his body and his blood as necessary to life: and what He has so joined, no man, and no Church, may put asunder.

Again: when St. Paul declares the sin of those who "shall eat this bread,—or—drink this cup of the Lord unworthily";

* Hierurgia, p. 203.

† John vi. 53-58.

he may, indeed, be not unjustly understood to have in his mind the possibility that an unworthy communicant might presume to partake either of the bread or of the cup without partaking of both : but what such a person might be so daring as to do, is no proof whatever either that worthy communicants would partake of one only, or that the Eucharist was distributed in one kind only. The misconduct and sin of the profane would be no rule either for the godly, or for the ministrations of the Church.

The rule laid down by our Lord Himself in these words: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you": and "whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life"; declaring the necessity and benefit of partaking of both, must ever hold good.

And in the institution of the Eucharist, they to whom the body of our Lord was given, had his blood given to them also : and St. Paul tells us that to one as well as to the other was joined the command "This do ye." Not a word was uttered by our Lord, which could warrant the notion, that the very same thing was meant by, or was contained in, or was conveyed by, each of the elements; that his body with its blood was in the bread, or that his blood in his body was in the wine; and that therefore, he that received the one kind, received that which is in the other, and need not receive both. He took each kind distinctly; He consecrated each kind distinctly; He gave each kind distinctly, and separately from the other. And He called each by its distinct name: He called the bread by the name of his body, and the wine by the name of his blood. He did not say of the bread, that it was his living body; nor of the wine, that it was his blood as in his body: but He called the bread his body given, and the wine, his blood poured out. His body and his blood were not joined together under the bread or under the wine: but they were separate in their respective symbols; the body without the blood in one; the blood poured out from the body in the other.

It is truly astonishing that these plain words alone; "This is my blood which is shed for you," have not prevented such delusions as have led to the denial of the cup. For in that his blood was shed, and it is his blood which was shed, which we receive; it is his blood, shed, poured out from his body; or else it would not be shed: and if it be his blood shed, it is not his blood still in his body or returned to it.

It was, of course, impossible for the theologians of Rome to deny that our Lord instituted and administered the Sacrament in both kinds : but they pretend that this was not with a view to his disciples generally, and that He Himself afterwards celebrated it in one kind. They pretend that He administered both the bread and the wine to the twelve apostles, for the reason that by doing so, with the command ; ‘Do this,’ He consecrated them to be Priests. And most certainly, by commanding them to do as He had done, He also conveyed authority to them, to celebrate this Sacrament : but it cannot be shown how the delivery of the cup made them Priests, more than the delivery of the bread ; or how the delivery of both kinds made them Priests, more than the delivery of one kind : if it be true, that Christ is whole and entire, and that there is the true Sacrament, under either species, as the Church of Rome affirms. For according to this doctrine of the Real Presence, there is nothing in the one kind which is not in the other : and it is as needless to consecrate, as it is to distribute, both. The doctrine of the Real Presence would make them Priests just as much by the delivery of the bread, as they would be made by the delivery of both wine and bread.

That our Lord afterwards celebrated the Sacrament in one kind, or so administered it to the two disciples at Emmaus,* is one of those bold assertions which none but a disputant, very hardly pressed, will venture to make for lack of better reasons. For, in the first place, there is no proof whatever that our blessed Lord did celebrate or administer the Sacrament on that occasion : and in the second place, it would not follow, that because bread alone is mentioned, therefore bread only was administered. When we say in the Lord’s Prayer, ‘Give us this day our daily bread,’ we do not pray for bread only, but for both meat and drink : and this is a common meaning for bread in Holy Scripture. In the place, therefore, referred to, we cannot admit that, because bread only is mentioned, wine is therefore excluded. And it may be also remarked, that if our Lord, on that occasion, did administer in one kind only, He also consecrated in one kind only : which is directly opposed to the Roman doctrine : for it requires both kinds to be consecrated, though one kind only is allowed to be distributed.

* See Appendix D D.

But paramount above all such pleas and precedents, and all such unwarranted applications of Holy Scripture, as are advanced for the practice of Communion in one kind, is the fact, that it is not the same thing which is given, or received under each kind. Our Lord did not call either the bread or the wine his body and his blood. He called each by a distinct name, and made each a distinct thing from the other. He called the bread his body given, broken; and He called the wine his blood poured out. The blood was poured out from the body; and the body therefore had not the blood in it. The bread is not his body and his blood, neither is the wine. Nor does the bread contain his body and blood, nor yet does the wine. The presence of the body and blood of Christ is not in the bread or in the wine: but the bread is his body, and is not his blood; and the wine is his blood and is not his body. The body and the blood, the one given and the other poured out, are separate and distinct from each other; and to give or receive the one is not to give or receive the other. The denial of the cup, therefore, is utterly indefensible. It comes from a false doctrine of the Sacrament; it sacrilegiously abstracts one part, and makes a falsehood of the other. Thus the doctrine of "The Real Presence of our Lord in His glorified body, under the form of the bread and wine," overthrows the Sacrament which Christ ordained, and substitutes for it a rite by which rationalism in vain attempts to explain it.

But this chapter must not be concluded without some observations on the doctrinal signification and bearing of administering the Eucharist by the bread dipped in the wine.

The rise and history of this practice has been briefly sketched in the previous part of this Chapter. But if we may argue from the present state of the Liturgies of the East, we should conclude that it prevailed more extensively there, and was not forbidden by any authority of the Church in that part of the world, subsequently to the great Schism. Taking the eight Liturgies placed before us by the late Dr. Neale, we find that in seven of them, St. Chrysostom's, the Armenian, St. James's, St. Basil's, the Coptic St. Basil's, the Mozarabic, and Theodore's, the Interpreter,* a portion or all of the consecrated bread is dipped into the chalice: and in the Liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, and Armenian Church, the bread and wine are adminis-

* Pp. 654, 646, 651, 655, 652, 653, 669.

tered together by a spoon from the chalice.* In the Liturgies of St. James, St. Mark, in the Coptic St. Basil, the Mozarabic, and Theodore, the bread and wine are administered separately.† While in the Liturgies of St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, and the Mozarabic, the Priest receives, and administers to the Deacon separately.‡

Under three of these Liturgies, therefore, St. Chrysostom's, St. Basil's, and the Armenian, the bread is dipped or sopped in the wine; and both are administered to the people by one action together.

Now let the words and facts of the institution of the Eucharist be considered. Our Lord took the bread, saying, "This is my body which is given for you": and so He gave it to the disciples. Likewise also He took the cup, saying, "This is my blood, which is shed for you"; and so He gave it to them. The one was his body given, the other was his blood shed; one his body dead, the other his blood poured out from his body. And so they were given separately: and their being separated and being given separately, symbolised the Lord's death. They "shew forth the Lord's death till He come."

But this symbolism is lost in dipping the bread in the wine. As in the Liturgy of St. James, the Priest, when he dips part of the bread in the chalice, says: "The union of the most holy Body and precious Blood of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ"; the union of the bread and wine represents the union of his Body and Blood. It shows forth, not his death, but his life. It shows his blood, not shed, not poured out from his body. And so, a writer of the 12th century, Honorius Augustodunensis, says that "when the Bread is put into the Wine, it is represented, that the soul of our Lord returned into his body." §

Surely, the character and nature of the Sacrament are completely changed by this mode of celebration or administration. It is, undoubtedly, more consistent with the doctrine of "The Real Presence," than the Roman mode of celebration, or the rites according to which the advocates of nineteenth century doctrine in the Church of England have to celebrate and ad-

* P. 678.

† Pp. 675, 680, 656, 681.

‡ Pp. 666, 670, 681. See also *The Divine Liturgy of the Armenian Church*, by the Rev. S. C. Malan, pp. 47, 48, 50, and note 2, 51, for references to that office.

§ L'Arroque, p. 466.

minister: but it is not a doing of what our Lord did, and bids us "do." It is a doing of what He did not. It is an adding to that which He did; and this, so as even to counteract it, and to repeal his words. He gave the bread and wine, He gave his body and his blood, separately from each other; but these Liturgies give them together. He gave his blood poured out, which can only mean, poured out from his body: but they give it with his body; and—not—poured out from it.

I must think, therefore, that they who are so piously and justly desirous of the union of Christendom, will do well to bear in mind, and to weigh the consequences of, this practice which prevails so much in the Eastern Church: and not to imagine that communion with it is safe, merely because the Eucharist appears to be administered in it in both kinds to the people.

The Liturgies which prescribe dipping of the bread in the wine, are greatly changed from their primitive condition, and greatly corrupted by the change. No Liturgy of Christ's Church could, in its primitive form, have prescribed an action so much at variance with the institution, the words, and actions, of our Lord, as dipping the bread in the wine, and administering both together.

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

THE EUCHARIST A FEAST UPON A SACRIFICE.

THE Holy Eucharist is a communion and a sacrifice: or more properly, we partake of a sacrifice, and we offer sacrifice, in that service. Of the sacrifice of which we partake, we have treated in the former part of this work: and we have now to consider the sacrifice which we offer.

But there is a peculiar aspect of the sacrifice of which we partake, which must be yet more clearly developed and pointed out, both in its substantive character, and in its relation to this question: for while it is generally admitted, that we do partake of a sacrifice in the Eucharist, it is part of the Roman, and of the nineteenth century, doctrines, that it is a sacrifice which we ourselves offer. They teach, indeed, a two-fold sacrifice: a sacrifice, first, of the bread and wine; and secondly, a sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, as contained in them or under their forms, and offered up by us to God.

Now Our Lord has most clearly stated in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, the necessity and benefits of eating his flesh and drinking his blood; and by the institution of his Holy Supper, He has appointed a way in which we are to do that which is so necessary and beneficial. He took bread, and gave it, saying, "Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you;" and He took wine and gave it, saying, "Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood which is shed for you." And both his body was given and his blood was shed, "for the remission of sins." His body, therefore, and his blood, thus given and shed, was a sacrifice for sins: and to eat his body and drink his blood, is to partake of that sacrifice. It is to take our share of his body slain for our sins, and of his blood poured out for our

sins : and as Christ is not divided, it is to eat Him, and so live by Him.* And we do this in eating the bread and drinking the wine, which He has ordained for this purpose. We eat the bread, because He said, "This is my body," and it is necessary that we should eat his flesh : we drink the wine, because He said, "This is my blood," and it is necessary that we should drink his blood. And thus in and by eating that bread and drinking that wine, we partake of and feast upon the sacrifice of Christ. The Eucharist, therefore, is a feast upon the sacrifice of Christ.

This is the peculiar feature of the sacrifice of which we partake in the Lord's Supper : and a few words on the sacrifices of the ancient world will enable us more clearly to see and appreciate its importance.

Of the five different kind of sacrifices amongst the Jews, the whole-burnt offerings, the sin-offerings, the trespass offerings, the peace-offerings, and the Passover, the burnt-offerings alone were entirely consumed upon the altar. The sin and the trespass offerings were partly burnt upon the altar, and partly eaten by the Priests in the Temple : the peace-offerings were divided into three portions, one of which was burnt upon the altar, another was appointed for the Priests, and the remainder was eaten as a feast by the offerer and such other persons as he might invite : and in the Passover, all the flesh was to be eaten by those who celebrated it. A like custom prevailed amongst the Gentiles. And, as we learn from St. Paul's expostulation with the Corinthians, it had the same meaning with Jews and Gentiles ; namely, that they who ate of the sacrifice, were as those for whom it had been offered, and shared in the same act of worship towards the object of that worship. Those who ate of sacrifices which had been offered to demons, thereby worshipped those demons, and had communion with them. And those who ate of sacrifices which had been offered to the true God, thereby worshipped Him, and had communion with Him, being partakers of the benefits of the sacrifice.

Therefore as Christ "offered Himself without spot to God," we worship God in partaking of his sacrifice, have communion with Him, and partake of the benefits of his sacrifice.

In the ancient sacrifices, one offering sufficed for all who were partakers of the sacrifice. The flesh was brought from the altar, prepared for the feast, and placed upon tables : when the offerer and his friends sat down to eat it. And the flesh being

* John vi. 57.

thus set before them, was a proof, of itself, to those who might have been absent from the previous rite, that the sacrifice had been duly performed. The sacrifice being once made, they made no offering or sacrifice of it again.

So with regard to our participation of the sacrifice of Christ. He made "the offspring of" his "body—once for all." He "offered one sacrifice for sins for ever": and "by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."* He never offered Himself but that once. He has never offered Himself since, nor can He: for "He dieth no more: death hath no more dominion over Him." "He liveth unto God": † "He ever liveth." ‡ Nor is there any word in Scripture from which it could be, not to say concluded, but even imagined, that any human power could now offer Him up. And if it were possible that He could again offer Himself, or that any human power could offer Him, it would be both unnecessary, and derogatory to the one offering which He has made. For having died unto sin once, He now "ever liveth to make intercession for us," giving continual and perpetual efficacy to his sacrifice: whereas, if it needed repetition, it would be but on a par with the sacrifices of the law, which were repeated year by year continually, for the only reason that they could not take away sin. But "now hath He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself: and as it is appointed unto men once to die,—so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." §

Of this Sacrifice, of this one offering, once made, once for all made, never to be repeated by Him, never possible to be offered by any power upon earth, we partake in the Eucharist. It is not, as some, blinded to the plain self-contradiction of their own words, call it, "a continuous sacrifice." It is a sacrifice of continuous power; of power "from the foundation of the world" to its end, and throughout the eternal future. But when made upon the cross, He who made it, said, "It is finished." It was "full, perfect, and sufficient—for the sins of the whole world." He died "once," and can never die again. Ever since "the third day," when "it was not possible that He should be holden of it," || death has lost all power over Him. "He ever liveth," and therefore cannot be, or offer, "a continuous sacrifice."

* Heb. x. 10, 12, 14.

† Rom. vi. 9, 10.

‡ Heb. vii. 25.

§ Heb. ix. 26, 27, 28.

|| Acts ii. 24.

When, therefore, we partake of his sacrifice, when we eat his flesh and drink his blood, in his holy Supper, we partake of a sacrifice, not made, not possible to be made, by us; but made only by our Lord Himself, upon the cross, so many hundred years ago. This holy rite is to us a feast upon his Sacrifice. As the Jews feasted on sacrifices which had been offered by them to God; so Christians, in the Holy Communion, partake of the body and blood of Christ, which He offered upon the cross, that "one oblation of Himself once offered," by which He "made—a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," from the beginning to the end of time. And we partake of it at this distance of time, as really and truly, as fully and effectually, as we could have done, if we had been present at the moment and at the very place of its oblation.

Then, again, as they who feasted of old on the sacrifices, saw in the flesh upon the table prepared for their use, an undeniable proof that they had been duly offered: so when the body and blood of Christ are offered to us from God's Table, his death is shown forth to us, and we in turn also show it forth; and see an undeniable and effectual proof, that He died for our sins, and gives to us, if we will humbly and thankfully receive, his true body to eat, and his true blood to drink.

We feast upon the Sacrifice which He once made; upon a past, and not upon a present, sacrifice: and we are therein worshippers of God, and have communion in its benefits.

Now that the Eucharist is a feast, every Christian, I suppose, will allow. It is called "The Lord's Supper" in our Liturgy, Catechism, and the Thirty-nine Articles: and the name "Cœna Domini," is applied to it throughout the whole of Western Christendom. But beyond this point, that it is a feast, there is the greatest divergence of opinion. What the feast consists of; what is its subject; what it is that we feast upon; has been, and is, a theme of endless disputation: whether a purely spiritual feast; or a partly material and a partly spiritual feast; whether that which we feast upon is a sacrifice; whether, if it be a sacrifice, it be a present or a past sacrifice; and, if it be a present sacrifice, then, what the sacrifice is.

With some, it is true, the Eucharist is a feast only in name; for that, they allege, there is nothing, whether sacrifice, or no

sacrifice, on which we can feast, either materially or spiritually. With most, however, the Eucharist is, either avowedly or implicitly, a feast upon a real sacrifice; part maintaining that this is a present sacrifice; and part maintaining that it is not a present, but a past, sacrifice. With those who hold that the feast is upon a present sacrifice, there is a proper material sacrifice made at every celebration of this Sacrament, a sacrifice of the elements of bread and wine. But here, again, they divide: some maintaining a sacrifice of the bare unconsecrated elements; some, a sacrifice of the consecrated elements, as united and "replenished with the Holy Spirit:"* some, a sacrifice of the consecrated elements, yet not of them, but of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ said to be in them; and some, as it would appear, a double sacrifice, first, of the elements before consecration, and next of the elements after consecration, as having in, or under, or with, them, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ. And lastly, they who maintain that the feast in the Eucharist is a feast not upon a present, but upon a past, sacrifice, reject all theories of a material sacrifice in this sacrament. They allow that, under certain conditions, there may be real, or *quasi*, material oblations, not indeed essential, but accidental, to the sacrament: but they refuse the name of sacrifice to every material thing offered by Priest or people; maintaining that we can offer none but spiritual sacrifices, on which, obviously, there is no feast; and that the sacrifice on which we do feast, is that one only true sacrifice which was made by our Lord once for all upon the cross. This is what is meant by the doctrine, that the Eucharist is a feast on a sacrifice.

To establish this doctrine more fully, is the object of this part of my work; in which I propose to consider and determine upon the objections which have been made against it, and the theories which have been advanced in its stead.

* Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, II. p. 201. Part I. c. iii. 3.

CHAPTER II.

REVIEW OF OBJECTIONS BY BICKERSTETH AND OTHERS ; HICKES, JOHNSON, AND MOSHEIM : AND THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

I. THE late Mr. Bickersteth objected in the following terms to the doctrine, that in the Eucharist we feast upon the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ :—

1. "We do not eat of the victim itself. What we do is in remembrance of Him who was the victim." 2. "The sacrifice for sin is the principal point commemorated, and the Jewish sacrifice for sin was not to be eaten." 3. "The notion does not necessarily flow either from the Apostle's statement in the Epistle to the Corinthians, or our Lord's words in the appointment."*

Now the first of these objections is based upon a misunderstanding of the doctrine, which, setting forth that we feast upon the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ made once for all upon the cross, necessarily implies that the feast is spiritual, and not literal ; a feast upon that which is past, and was done, once for all, eighteen hundred years ago. And the objection cannot apply to this doctrine, until it be put in this shape : "We do not eat of the victim itself literally ; and therefore we do not eat of the victim itself spiritually : " the conclusiveness of which argument, no one, I suppose, would have been more ready to deny than the pious objector himself. Nor is the fact, that "what we do is in remembrance of Him who was the victim," less consistent with the doctrine that we feast on that one sacrifice made and perfected many hundred years before : for this must be a feast of "remembrance of Him who was the victim."

2. The second objection urges that "the sacrifice for sin is the principal point commemorated" in the Lord's Supper ; "and the Jewish sacrifice for sin was not to be eaten." But our Lord not only gave Himself a sacrifice for sin, but is also

* On the Lord's Supper, 1838, p. 11, note.

“our Passover—sacrificed for us.”* And as the Jewish Passover was eaten, so we “keep the feast” on the true Passover, who said: ‘Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you:’—“he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.”†

These two objections will be answered more fully, when we come to those which were made by Johnson and Mosheim.

3. Mr. Bickersteth objected, thirdly, that “The notion does not necessarily flow either from the Apostle’s statement in the Epistle to the Corinthians, or our Lord’s words in the appointment.” Now the statement of the apostle to which this reference is made, I take to be the passages in the 10th chapter of the first Epistle: for the passage in the following chapter is the account of the institution, and is to be taken as identical for the purpose with “our Lord’s words in the appointment.” St. Paul, then, in the 10th chapter says: “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?” The bread and the cup are the communion, that is, either the communication, or the participation, of the body and the blood of Christ, the means by which they are communicated to us, or by which we partake of them: and as by these means we partake of the body and blood of Christ, we do feast on his sacrifice: and, therefore, the Holy Communion in which we do this, is a feast on a sacrifice.

And that “our Lord’s words in the appointment” teach us that in obeying that appointment we do feast on a sacrifice, even the sacrifice of his most precious body and blood, seems to be so clear, that it is marvellous how anyone, who believes that our Lord offered Himself a sacrifice for sins, could for a moment doubt it. The apostle tells us that He “hath given himself an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour;” ‡ and that “we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all;” and this he afterwards speaks of as “one sacrifice for sins for ever.”§ Therefore the body of our Lord was a sacrifice: and since He said, “Take, eat; this is my body,” He told us to eat of that sacrifice, and taught us how we were to do it. So that “our Lord’s words in the appointment” do most clearly and necessarily show that we do feast on his sacrifice in the Sacrament of his most precious body and blood.

* 1 Cor. v. 7.

† Eph. v. 2.

‡ 1 Cor. v. 7. St. John, vi. 53, 57.

§ Heb. x. 10, 12.

II. When Cudworth published his work, proving “that the Eucharist, considered in its spiritual and mystical view, is a feast upon a sacrifice,”* made, not at the time of celebration, but long before; it was opposed by a few very learned and considerable divines, as novel, and contradictory to all antiquity. But they had theories of their own to serve, and therefore did not give sufficient weight to his arguments, even if they rightly understood his doctrine.

Now I apprehend that no doctrine which is scriptural can, in reality, be novel. It cannot, indeed, be said that every doctrine of Scripture has been reduced into dogmatic form, even at this distance of time from the formation of the Canon: and although a dogmatic form may be new, the doctrine which it expresses may be as ancient as the Scripture itself, and be strictly deduced from it. The novelty of the deduction cannot diminish or affect its truth. But a doctrine may be ancient, and yet be neither true nor Catholic. The antiquity of Gnosticism or Montanism, does not make those heresies orthodox; or prove them to be Catholic. And the same may be said of many opinions and practices of very eminent and ancient Fathers.

If, therefore, this doctrine, that the Eucharist is a feast upon the sacrifice of Christ made by Him on the cross, be scriptural; the date of its being brought into dogmatic form cannot detract from its truth or importance. If it be implicitly contained in Holy Scripture, the date of its explicit deduction therefrom is no argument against its truth: and if the deduction be of a late date, this will prove, not that it is unimportant, but that some opposing error which required its clear statement, was not hitherto developed.

I cannot here go into the Scriptural proof that the Eucharist is a feast on a sacrifice analogous to the feasts appointed in the Mosaic law; for I have done this before, and must therefore merely refer to the summary of the argument, given in the preceding chapter. But I must say a few words more on the question of the antiquity of the doctrine, as distinct from its foundation in Scripture.

It will not be denied that the ancient Fathers believed that our Lord Jesus Christ “gave Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour”: that by this “one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified”: that therefore this offering is never to be made again by Him, nor can be made again by any other; but, according to

* Waterland's Review, c. xi. Works, Oxford, 1823, vii. 325.

his own command, is ever to be commemorated till his coming again: that in commemorating this sacrifice, the "cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ," and "the bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ":* that in this communion we feast upon the heavenly and spiritual food of his body once for all given, and of his blood once for all shed: and that we are thus partakers of the sacrifice of that pure and priceless victim. But what less does this amount to, than that He is our sacrifice, and that in his Holy Supper, He makes us partakers of that sacrifice?—in other words, that the sacrifice was long ago made, but that, in commemorating it, we even now partake of it? in one word, that the Eucharist is a feast upon his sacrifice?

I do not say that any passages can be produced from the ancient Fathers, formally propounding this doctrine: but it would, I conceive, be easy to bring abundant proof that they implicitly and unanimously held it. Just as we might say, that it is not laid down in Scripture, formally, and in so many words; but that it is virtually and implicitly contained in it. And the case is the same with many other doctrines,—in fact, we might say, the case with all: for it is only by "comparing spiritual things with spiritual," by putting together the various passages of Scripture on any subject, and deducing from them one conclusion consistent with all, that we can ascertain "the mind of the Spirit." So also with the ancient Fathers; many questions might arise, on which they had never come to a formal or dogmatical judgment, though we might be able to form a true judgment from the suffrages of their various expressions. And as he who has an account laid before him, in which the different items or quantities are given, but not cast up, cannot be fairly charged with making a new or contradictory account, when he adds up all the quantities together, and determines their total amount: so neither can that doctrine be novel, or contradictory to antiquity, which is a legitimate conclusion from the premisses of the ancient Fathers.

It is true, that, in the opinion of many of them, there is a sacrifice made at every celebration of the Eucharist: but it would be premature to make more than a passing allusion to it here. I only now mention it, lest it should appear to have been overlooked in the observations just now made. And I must here only say that I cannot find any contrariety between the genuine doctrine of the ancient Fathers on the Eucharistic

* Eph. v. 2; Heb. x. 4; 1 Cor. x. 16.

sacrifice, and the doctrine now before us: for whether the elements be or be not a sacrifice, there is no feast on them.

III. Hickes represents that neither priests nor people “ever feasted of any sacrifices which they did not offer before”: and that therefore “granting that the Lord’s Supper was a feast upon a sacrifice,” “the mystical body and blood of Christ, of which we are partakers at the Lord’s Table,” are “first solemnly offered up.”⁹⁴ Of course, this does not mean, that no one ever partook of a sacrifice which he had not himself offered before: for this would be contrary to the well-known custom of the Jews, as may be seen in the case of Elkanah (1 Sam. i. 4-9), of Samuel and Saul (1 Sam. ix. 12, 13, 22-24), of Samuel and David (1 Sam. xvi. 2-5, 11), and others. But it means, if it mean anything applicable to the purpose, that no one ever feasted on a sacrifice, a literal and material sacrifice, which had not been literally sacrificed, before the feast, which formed part of the rites, was held. In short, that no one ever feasted on a sacrifice, which was not a sacrifice. And it must be said, though with unfeigned respect for the learning and judgment of this author, that no conclusion from such an argument need be discussed. The body and blood of Christ are a sacrifice; and it is on that sacrifice we feast, though it was offered eighteen hundred years ago. Nor is there any need to offer it again, either by Himself, or by a Priest, to constitute it a sacrifice, or to enable Christians to partake of it. A spiritual feast may be on that which either is past, or is yet to come: we may feast either by remembrance, or by anticipation.

On the offering of “the mystical body and blood of Christ,” reflections will be found in subsequent places; as well as on the very important distinction between oblations and sacrifices, which is so much lost sight of.

IV. Johnson, in his “Unbloody Sacrifice,” objects; 1. that “upon this supposition,” of our feasting in the Eucharist upon the sacrifice of Christ, “our Saviour made a feast upon the sacrifice, before the sacrifice had been offered:” whereas “it is exceedingly preposterous,” he argues, “and contrary to the very nature of things, as well as all the ancient established method of sacrifice, to eat or make a feast on a sacrifice that has not yet been offered:”

⁹⁴ Christian Priesthood Asserted, sect. x. ii. Works, Oxford, 1847, II, p. 178. The works of Hickes and Johnson having been recently republished in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, the objections of these very learned and esteemed writers demand the consideration which I have given to them.

2. That, "if the consecrated Bread and Wine" be not the sacrifice,

"then it cannot be said that the Eucharist is a feast on a sacrifice, unless you will say, that this Bread and Wine are converted into the substance of Christ's sacrificed Body and Blood, and so run into the absurd and justly abhorred doctrine of Transubstantiation:"

3. That—

"upon this supposition, the Eucharist is a feast on a sacrifice, which now has no being in the nature of things; for the natural Body and Blood of Christ, as they are represented in the Eucharist, separate from each other, are now nowhere in the universe."*

Now the fact, that the feast in the Eucharist is a spiritual feast, and not literal or material, cuts away the ground from all these objections: for, 1. one may feast spiritually upon that which has not yet come to pass; one may enjoy a thing in hope and by anticipation: and, therefore, our Lord could make a spiritual feast for his disciples upon his sacrifice before that sacrifice was offered: 2. There may be a spiritual feast upon the sacrifice of Christ once offered, though the elements neither be a sacrifice, nor be transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ: and 3. that a spiritual feast may be on that which once was, and now is not anywhere, even upon "the body and blood of Christ, as they are represented in the Eucharist, separate from each other," but "now nowhere in the universe" in that condition. A spiritual feast, as I have just said, may be either retrospective or anticipatory, and may be, in either case, not less real than a material feast.

Johnson held the doctrine of a feast upon a sacrifice in the Eucharist, but a feast on a material sacrifice, the sacrifice of bread and wine consecrated into the sacramental body and blood of Christ. And though I do not clearly understand whether he meant that the feast on that material sacrifice was material also or only spiritual; his arguments seem to require that the feast is material, as well as the sacrifice. His doctrine, therefore, if I am not mistaken, differed from that which I am defending, in setting forth a material feast instead of a spiritual feast: as well as in the sacrifice being repeated at every celebration of the Sacrament, instead of having been once for all perfected on the cross. But certainly, if there be a material sacrifice, there is no material feast, in the Eucharist. If we made a meal of the elements, it might be called a feast:

* Works, part ii. Pref. p. 5.

but to call the very small portion of bread and wine, which, as I believe, the Church of Christ everywhere, and at all times, has been accustomed to administer to each communicant, by the name of feast, would be an abuse of words.”⁹⁵ In the sense of the materialists, there can be no feast at all, either material or spiritual: for they deny the spiritual feast, if it be not in the material feast. And that there is no material feast in the Eucharist, everyone, who has ever attended the Sacrament, must know, in whatever branch of the Church it may have been.⁹⁶

The objections of Hickee and Johnson, as in part also those of Mosheim to be noticed presently, rest upon the supposition, that a feast must be of some material thing, and that they who feast on a sacrifice must have offered the sacrifice before they could feast on it. But these suppositions are clearly untenable. They amount to a denial that there can be any spiritual feast whatever. Whereas there may be a feast on the good things of the Gospel, without the intervention of any material thing: and though it be indisputable, that a feast on material sacrifices necessarily involves the offering of them just before the feast; it cannot be true of that sacrifice once for all offered, which has “made a full, perfect, and sufficient satisfaction for the sins of the whole world,” and has “perfected for ever them that are sanctified.”

A more particular account of Johnson’s theory must be given, and it will be found in the next chapter. But it is necessary to remark a very glaring inconsistency between his objections which we have noticed, and his opinions on the sacrifice of our Lord itself. He says that Christ “as a Priest, did offer his Body and Blood to God when He instituted” the Eucharist: that He offered the Sacrifice of his Body and Blood under the figure,—the symbols,—pledges,—or representations—of Bread and Wine.” And he allowed himself to be carried to such lengths in support of this position, as to say, that “there is no evidence that He did again on the cross make the oblation of His Body and Blood as a Priest:” and that

“they are hard put to it for arguments against the doctrine [his doctrine] of the Eucharist, who will assert, that Christ offered Himself upon the Cross only here on earth, and that He was offered only by being slain;

⁹⁵ “Modicum accipimus, et in corde saginamur. Non ergo quod videtur, sed quod creditur, pascit.”—August. Sermon. 112.

⁹⁶ Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ οὔτε πολὺ λαμβάνομεν, ἀλλ’ ὀλίγον, ἵνα γινώμεν οὐκ εἰς πλησμονήν, ἀλλ’ εἰς ἁγιασμόν. “For this reason we receive not much [of the bread and wine] but little, that we may know that it is not for satiety, but for sanctification.” First Nicene Council, as reported by Gelasius Cyzicenus: Albertin. De Sacramento Eucharistie, 384.

and so render the sacrifice of Christ a very bloody one indeed; so bloody as that it cannot be reconciled to purity of any sort, until killing one's-self be esteemed a virtue."*

He maintains, that although our Lord did not actually and literally, yet He did truly, offer his Body and Blood to God in the Eucharist, † because He did it in full purpose, intention, and devotion. He maintains that our Lord offered Himself then in spirit, and then only offered Himself at all: but he refuses to admit that we can in spirit be partakers of his sacrifice; that we can be partakers in spirit of a sacrifice which was offered only in spirit; and that we can as truly feast upon it, as it was truly offered.

Yet in another place, he says: "He began this oblation in the Eucharist, and continued it on the cross. Nothing but His death could be a satisfaction for our sins; and this was actually accomplished on the cross: and this death of His was never to be repeated; it was the effect of His personal oblation of Himself, which He began in the Eucharist; and since He was but once to suffer, He was but once to die." ‡

V. Mosheim objected that—

"Jesus Christ offered Himself as a sacrifice to the Most High for the sins of men. Therefore His sacrifice properly answers to those sacrifices of the Jews, which were made for sin to appease God, and for the whole people. But of these sacrifices, the blood of which was brought into the Holy of Holies, it was lawful for none to eat; but, on the contrary, they were, by the command of God, wholly consumed by fire, so that it was not possible to make a feast upon them. If, therefore, the sacrifice which Christ made for us be of this kind, how can it be rightly said, that a feast ought to be added to this sacrifice, and that the Holy Supper is that feast?"⁹⁷

* II. Introd. pp. 28, 35, 39, and c. i. sect. 5, pp. 96, 97.

† See Appendix E E.

‡ Part I. c. ii. sect. 1, I. 163, 164.

⁹⁷ Præfatio ad R. Cudworthi de vera notione Cœnæ Domini Lib. Sing. in vers. Lat. Syst. Intellect. Lugd. Bat. 1773, ii. 820. Bishop Andrewes says: "First, here is news, that we Christians, we also have 'our Passover': 2. Then, that in memory of it, we are 'to keep a feast.'—There be many kinds of offerings; this determineth, which of them Christ was. Such an one as we must *epulari*; that is, the peace-offering. For of the peace-offering, the flesh was to be eaten. Part God had, and part the offerer eat, in sign of perfect peace and reconciliation between them. Christ's blood not only in the basin for Baptism, but in the cup for the other sacrament. A sacrifice—so, to be slain; a propitiatory sacrifice—so, to be eaten. Thus 'Christ is a Passover.'—*Immolatus* is His part, to be slain. *Celebremus* is ours, to hold a feast.—If Christ be a propitiatory sacrifice, a peace-offering, I see not how we can avoid but the flesh of our peace-offering must be eaten in this feast by us, or else we evacuate the offering utterly, and lose the fruit of it. And was there a Passover heard of, and the lamb not eaten?—There was an offering in *immolatus*, and here is another, a new one, in *epulemur*. Offered for us there, offered to us here. There *per modum victimæ*, here *per modum epuli*.—That is offered to us—that was offered for us."—Sermon on the Resurrection, 1 Cor. v. 7, 8. Works, Oxford, 1841, II. pp. 290, 296, 298, 299, 301.

The simple and conclusive answer is, that the offering of our blessed Redeemer answers to all the sacrifices,⁹⁸ and not to any one of them exclusively. He is the substance of which they were the shadows; and He embodies wholly, in his one true sacrifice, that which each of its types but imperfectly, partially, and separately foreshadowed:⁹⁹ while his sacrifice will answer to none of the sacrifices of the law, if it be rigidly and exclusively compared in all particulars with them.

2. Mosheim again says—

“that a feast upon a sacrifice cannot be made or celebrated before the victim has been slain and offered to God. But that the Holy Supper was instituted by our Saviour before He offered Himself upon the cross, and expiated the sins of mankind by His blood and death.”

And he demands, therefore,

“how that Supper which was celebrated before the victim was slain, and was enjoined by the command of Christ on His disciples, could have the nature of a banquet, consisting of parts of a sacrifice already made”:

and he asserts that this difficulty is insuperable,

“unless one should be so bold as to affirm that the Holy Supper which was celebrated by Christ Himself, is different in kind and nature from the Eucharists which have ever since been celebrated by His friends.”*

The simple fact, however, that it is not a literal feast we partake of, dissolves the whole of this formidable objection. We are not literally partakers of the body and blood of Christ, nor were the apostles at the institution. It is equally a spiritual and the same feast which they had at the first, and which the Church has ever since celebrated, and ever will cele-

⁹⁸ St. Augustine says of the sacrifices of the Old Testament, that “all such things have signified by many and various modes, one sacrifice, of which we now celebrate the memory. Omnia talia multis et variis modis unum sacrificium, cujus nunc memoriam celebramus, significaverint.”—*Contra Faust.* vi. c. 5, *Opp. Parisiis*, 1841, (Migne) viii. 231. And Fulgentius, in a work wrongly attributed to St. Augustine, says: “In those sacrifices [of carnal victims which were offered to the Son with the Father and the Holy Spirit—in the time of the Old Testament] was figuratively signified what *was to be given* to us: but in this sacrifice [of bread and wine to the Holy Trinity] is evidently shewn what *has now been given* to us. In those sacrifices the Son of God was fore-announced as to be slain for the impious: but in this He is announced as slain for the impious. In illis ergo sacrificiis quid nobis esset donandum figurate significabatur: in hoc autem sacrificio quid nobis jam donatum sit evidenter ostenditur. In illis sacrificiis prænuntiabatur Filius Dei pro impiis occidendus: in hoc autem pro impiis annuntiatur occisus.”—*Liber de Fide ad Petrum*, c. xix. in *Opp. S. August. Parisiis* (Migne) vi. 773.

⁹⁹ “Magnus erat et sine modo numerus sacrificiorum in lege, quæ omnia nova superveniens gratia uno complectitur sacrificio, unam et veram statuens hostiam. Great and unbounded was the number of sacrifices in the law, all of which a new grace supervening embraces in one sacrifice, appointing one and a true victim.”—St. Chrysostom in *Ps. 95*, cited by Bellarmin. *De Euch.* I. ii.

* *Præf. ad Cudworthi de vera notione*, &c. p. 820.

brate. The banquet does not consist literally of parts of a sacrifice, but spiritually of a whole sacrifice: and that sacrifice is not any sacrifice offered by us, but is the "Lamb without blemish and without spot, who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world."* And as the apostle St. Paul instructs us, that the Jews, even so far back as the time of Moses, many hundred years before the Lamb of God was actually sacrificed, "did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them; and that rock was Christ:" † so the apostles could eat the same spiritual meat, and drink the same spiritual drink; they could be partakers of the body and blood of Christ, and thus feast upon his sacrifice, even before He had literally offered it. The virtue of his death and passion flows back to the beginning of the world, as it will flow onward to the end of time. It pervades alike the sacrifices which prefigured, and the Eucharists which commemorate: giving life to the just by faith.

And if by types which foreshadowed the sacrifice of Christ, the old Fathers were in their measure partakers of its benefits; so, when He testified that "the hour was come," and He was "prepared as a lamb for the slaughter," the apostles could be partakers of like benefits, by the symbols of his passion, the pledges, and, thenceforward, the perpetual memorials, of his sacrifice. And so also can Christians to the end of time, be partakers of it, though it has been long since offered.

As He Himself said before He suffered, "This is my body which is broken for you. This is my blood which is shed for you": so they could feast on his body broken before it was broken, and on his blood shed, before it was shed; because they were to do it spiritually and by the power of that faith which "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." ‡ They could feast on his sacrifice before it was offered, as truly as their fathers, so long before, "did eat the same spiritual meat, and drink the same spiritual drink": and as truly as the Lord Jesus Himself said, "This is my body which is broken, This is my blood which is shed"; before his body was in reality broken, and his blood was, in fact and very deed, shed.

VI. The "Tracts for the Times" says: "There is yet another opinion, which must be mentioned, as being a modification or a portion of the old doctrine, and bearing witness to that, for

* 1 Pet. i. 19, 20.

† 1 Cor. x. 3, 4.

‡ Heb. xi. 1.

which it has been substituted. This is what has, since Cudworth's time, been commonly received, viz. that the Eucharist is 'a feast upon a sacrifice.' This, like so many other modern theories, takes up one half of the ancient doctrine, and then appears as new. It has, however, been valuable as keeping up a portion of the truth among such as would not, perhaps, have received the whole. But the 'feast upon a sacrifice,' implies, first, the offering of a sacrifice; and so, as Archdeacon *Daubeny* has well said, 'The Episcopal Church in Scotland keeps close to the original pattern of the primitive Church; and with the Church of England—considering the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be a feast upon a sacrifice, to constitute it such, makes that which is feasted upon first—a sacrifice, by having it offered up by a priest.'"¹⁰⁰

It is admitted, then, that the doctrine of the Eucharist, being a feast on a sacrifice, is "a portion of the old doctrine, and" bears "witness to it;" that it "takes up one half of the ancient doctrine," and has kept "up a portion of the truth": that is to say, that it is both ancient and true, so far as it goes. But it is maintained, that it requires to be completed by another "half" of "ancient doctrine": so that the whole, full, and complete doctrine must be, that in the Eucharist there is, first, a sacrifice made by the Priest at the time of the celebration of the Sacrament, and then, there is a feast upon that sacrifice. The sacrifice made by the Priest, is the elements, consecrated or unconsecrated: and on the elements there is no feast. There is a participation of them, and by means of them there is a feast on a sacrifice. But the doctrine in question is not, that we feast in the Eucharist upon a sacrifice, indefinitely; it is that we feast upon that which the elements symbolise and are called; upon the sacrifice of Christ, the sacrifice of his body and blood: a sacrifice which He alone did make, and He only could make. It is the sacrifice which He, the Great High Priest, made once for all upon the cross; and which, though it is the office of the Priest to commemorate, and to plead it for himself and his people, no Priest can make, offer, renew, or repeat. It is made and finished, and cannot be repeated either by our Lord Himself or by any other. The sacrifice is past, but its power will endure for ever. Nor can it be continuous, as is the fashion with some to say: for He died unto sin once;

¹⁰⁰ No. 81, p. 53. There is an inaccuracy in Archdeacon Daubeny's statement, from taking *oblation* as synonymous with *sacrifice*. He would have been nearer the truth if he had used the former instead of the latter.

He is alive for evermore ; and He can die, or be a sacrifice no more. There is, therefore, no inconsistency or defect in the doctrine, that in the Holy Communion we feast upon a sacrifice, made not at the time, but long before ; a sacrifice not made by a Priest in the celebration, but the sacrifice made by the Great High Priest upon the altar of the cross. It is a real, it is the only real and true sacrifice : and our feast upon it is real and true, because it is spiritual.

These objections represent all the reasons or arguments which, so far as I can find, have been urged against the doctrine, that the Eucharist is a feast on a sacrifice ;—that as the Jews feasted on some of their sacrifices, so, analogously, Christians in the Holy Communion, feast upon the body and blood of Christ ; upon a sacrifice not made, not offered in the celebration, but made by Him once for all upon the cross. And not one of these objections is found to apply against this doctrine. They apply only against misapprehensions of it. And though, on one hand, it has been objected to as novel ; on the other hand, it has been allowed to be ancient and true. Ancient, indeed, and true it must be, if our Lord did make Himself a sacrifice for sin ; if He gives us his body and blood in his Holy Supper : for then we do feast on his Sacrifice. And if He died once for all,* and “ by the offering of His body once for all ” has “ sanctified ” us, and “ perfected for ever them that are sanctified ” ; † if He “ dieth no more,” but has “ sat down at the right hand of God,” ever living and ever glorified : ‡ then it is upon the sacrifice of Christ, once, and once only, made upon the cross, that we feast : a sacrifice, not continued, or continuous, as some say ; not offered by any Priest on earth, but commemorated, when we break bread and drink wine, as He has ordained, in remembrance of Him. It is on this sacrifice only that we feast, although we do “ offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Him.” § And even if it were irrefragably demonstrated, that the elements are not only an oblation, but a proper material sacrifice also ; there is indeed a participation of them, but there is no feast upon them. The feast is not upon any sacrifice, material or spiritual, offered by us ; but on that one sacrifice of the cross, the power of which is as great now as it was at the first ; is, in very deed, continuous, and will be continuous for ever.

* Rom. vi. 10 ; Heb. vii. 27 ; ix. 12, 28.

† Heb. x. 10, 14.

‡ Rom. vi. 9 ; Heb. i. 3 ; x. 12 ; vii. 8, 25 ; Rev. i. 18 ; Jno. xvii. 5 ; Acts iii. 13.

§ 1 Pet. ii. 5.

CHAPTER III.

FOUR THEORIES OF MATERIAL SACRIFICE IN THE EUCHARIST.

THERE are four theories or schemes of a proper material sacrifice in the Eucharist: one setting forth a sacrifice of the bare unconsecrated elements of bread and wine; which is Mede's theory: another, setting forth a sacrifice of the consecrated elements, as united and "replenished with the Holy Spirit"; which is Johnson's theory: a third, setting forth a sacrifice of the elements before consecration, and again of the elements after consecration, as having in, or under, or with them, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ; which is the theory now professed by a party in the Church of England: and the fourth, which is the Roman system, makes a sacrifice of the elements before consecration, and after consecration offers them up as no longer bread and wine, but as converted into the very substance of the body and blood of Christ.

I. Mede is a great, if not the great authority with writers in the Church of England, for a material sacrifice in the Eucharist. But though his testimonies and opinions have been so often cited, I think that his theory has been but little understood of late. I will give here a connected view of it by extracts from his "Christian Sacrifice" and "Discourses." He says that "the Christian Sacrifice" is "an oblation of thanksgiving and prayer to God the Father through Jesus Christ and his Sacrifice, commemorated in the creatures of bread and wine, first offered to God to agnize him," or "where-with God had been first agnized," that is, acknowledged to be "Lord of the creature," and "giver of all" blessings; that the sacrifice is "of bare and naked bread and wine," "and no more"; "an act of oblatory praise and prayer by addressing or applying bread and wine unto the use of the Sacrament, and other gifts to the use of God's service": that "this Sacrifice is before the consecration of the elements," and is "as it were a prologue to the Sacrament": that "by invocation of

the Holy Ghost," the bread and wine from "holy" become "most holy," and are made the "holy signs" and symbols of "the body and blood of Christ": that "though the Eucharist be a Sacrifice,—yet is Christ in this Sacrifice no otherwise offered than by way of commemoration only of His Sacrifice once offered upon the cross": that "Christ is offered in this sacred Supper commemoratively only; that is, by this sacred rite of bread and wine we represent and inculcate His blessed passion to His Father; we put Him in mind thereof, by setting the monuments thereof before Him; we testify our own mindfulness thereof unto His Sacred Majesty; that so, He would, for His sake, according to the tenour of His covenant, in Him be favourable and propitious to us miserable sinners": that "the Sacrifice of Christians is nothing but that one Sacrifice of Christ once offered upon the cross, and again and again commemorated": that "we eat not the real body, nor drink the real blood of Christ," but "receive the signs and symbols" of them: that "he that receiveth the bread, as assuredly receiveth Christ's body, as if the bread were His body; he that receiveth the wine, as assuredly enjoyeth the blood of Christ, as if this wine were His very blood indeed":—on the whole, that bread and wine are "first offered" "to God, to agnize Him the Lord of the creature, and then received from Him again, in a banquet, as the symbols of the body and blood of His Son"; "the people giving a small thanksgiving, but receiving a great blessing; offering bread but receiving the body; offering wine, but receiving the mystical blood of Christ Jesus."*

II. Johnson maintained that "the true and full notion of the Eucharist is, that it is a religious feast upon bread and wine, that have first been offered in sacrifice to Almighty God, and are become the mysterious body and blood of Christ": that we offer the Sacramental body and blood of Christ: that "the sacrifice consists of bread and wine, consecrated into the sacramental body and blood of Christ by the secret operation of the Holy Spirit": that there is this one oblation only in the Eucharist, but "not exclusively of the celebrator's, first presenting them on the altar," being "first placed on the altar, in

* Mede's works, Lond. 1664. The Christian Sacrifice, II. c. 2, vol. i. p. 453; Disc. 49, pp. 393, 390, 389, 393, 390, 390; Christ. Sacrif. II. ii. p. 453; ix. 478; Ibid.; Ibid.; Disc. 43. p. 334; Disc. 49. p. 390; Christ. Sacrif. II. viii. p. 473; Disc. 43, p. 335; Christ. Sacrif. II. viii. 473; Disc. 49, p. 390.

order to the more solemn oblation": that "the natural body and blood of Christ, as they are represented in the Eucharist, separate from each other, are now nowhere in the universe": that "the body of Christ" as it now is, "is as far distant from us as heaven is from the earth": that "Christ's personal body and blood cannot be substantially present to us on earth": that it is impossible to receive His natural body and blood: "that at the prayers of the priest and people," there is a "descent" and "illapse" of the Holy Spirit, which "by its secret power overshadows the elements of bread and wine, and by its Divine influence renders them the body and blood of Christ in efficacy and virtue without changing their natural substance": that there is a peculiar "power and presence" of the Holy Spirit in and with the elements, an "immediate presence"; accompanying them, and "in union" with them: that He imparts a secret power to the sacramental body and blood of Christ, by which they are made to be in energy and effect, though not in substance, the very body and blood which they represent: and that thus they are filled with all the Divine grace and efficacy that the natural body was; "replenished with the Holy Spirit," and possessed "by this means of a life-giving power," "are made the most perfect and consummate representations of the body and blood of Christ," and "are not only substituted by His appointment and command to this purpose, but they are by the power of the Divine Spirit, which is communicated to them so often as the celebration of this mystery is repeated, made the lively efficacious sacrament of His body and blood: for the Holy Spirit is Christ's invisible Divine Deputy in His Church": that "the visible material substitutes of Christ's human nature are the bread and wine; and when the Holy Spirit, which is His invisible representative, communicates its power and presence to the symbols, which are His visible representatives, they do thereby become as full and authentic substitutes as it is possible for them to be": and that it is the Holy Spirit, and not the natural body and blood of Christ, which is united to His sacramental body.¹⁰¹

¹⁰¹ Unbloody Sacrifice, Oxford, 1847, II. 43: I. 5: 154, 155: II. 5: I. 444: 310: 321: 267. 271: II. 201: I. 279, 281, 286: I. 267: 344: II. 201, 272. I cannot refrain from noticing here the very portentous doctrine which seems, at least, to be involved in some of these statements. The descent and illapse of the Holy Spirit, and his secret power overshadowing the elements; his peculiar power and immediate presence in and with them, and communicated to them; his union with them, imparting to them a life-giving power, filling them with all the Divine grace and energy of the natural body, and replenishing them with Himself! I dare

He pronounces that there is but "one solemn act of oblation" or sacrifice in the Eucharist, the oblation of the consecrated bread and wine, and these elements not less bread and wine than they were before, but by the secret power of the Spirit, and his union and presence with them, as the deputy and invisible substitute of Christ, made "the mysterious body and blood of our ever blessed Redeemer:" that as He sacrificed Himself at the institution of the Eucharist under the sacramental forms, so are his sacramental body and blood offered up again whensoever the Eucharist is celebrated: and that by this sacrifice the dominion of Almighty God is acknowledged, thanks are rendered for his goodness, especially in the redemption of the world by Christ Jesus, and pardon of sin and other Divine blessings are impetrated.*

III. The third system of material sacrifice in the Eucharist, as now maintained by a party in the English Church, is of recent growth. I think it had its rise chiefly from Dr. Pusey's Sermon before the University of Oxford in 1843, and since that time has been gradually elaborated and developed. Mede's

not refrain from expressing my conviction that they amount almost, if not altogether, to an error so monstrous as the impanation of the Holy Ghost. Johnson, certainly, never could have suspected this, as it would appear, inevitable conclusion, for otherwise he would have felt, as I must believe, that a theory which depended on or involved an error of such magnitude, must be no longer maintained, or, at least, must be proportionably remodelled.

Thorndike, who held that the elements are, yet "improperly," a sacrifice, seems to me to have erred in a like manner. He says: that the bread and wine are consecrated "by the act of the Church, upon God's word of institution, praying, that the Holy Ghost, coming down upon the present elements, 'may make them the Body and Blood of Christ.' Not by changing them into the nature of flesh and blood: as the bread and wine, that nourished our Lord Christ on earth, became the Flesh and Blood of the Son of God by becoming the Flesh and Blood of His Manhood, hypostatically united to His Godhead; saith St. Gregory Nyssen: but immediately and *ipso facto* by being united to the Spirit of Christ, that is, His Godhead. For the Flesh and Blood by incarnation, the elements by consecration, being united to the Spirit, that is, the Godhead of Christ, become both one sacramentally, by being both one with the Spirit or Godhead of Christ, to the conveying of God's Spirit to the Christian."—Just Weights and Measures, c. xiv. sect. 5, vol. v. 173. This again, seems at least, to amount to impanation and invination of the Second Person, as Johnson's of the Third Person, of the Trinity.

Thorndike calls this the "doctrine of Gregory Nyssen;" but the place he cites proves no more, I think, than that Gregory believed that "the bread being sanctified by the Word of God, is changed into the body of God the Word:" which, like all the testimonies of the Fathers for many centuries, amounts only to the statement of our Lord Himself, when He said "This is my body"; quite another doctrine from that which teaches that the real presence of our Lord's body is in or under it: though the advocates of the "real objective presence" do not perceive the difference.

The republication of Johnson's and Thorndike's works in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, by which they are commended as "maintaining and inculcating the Doctrines and Discipline of the Anglican branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church," makes it necessary to warn the reader, that notwithstanding the great value of the works contained in this collection, they do not in all points maintain the doctrine of the Church of England.

* I. 154: 323: 360, 361, 384.

theory of a material sacrifice, or oblation of the elements for consecration, had been long accepted by eminent divines, who, like Johnson, grafted their own peculiar opinions upon it: but in the beginning and the early part of the present century, all notions of a material oblation or sacrifice in the Eucharist seem to have died away. So, at least, it would appear from the universal practice, of the parish clerk, or other subordinate, placing the elements upon the altar before the Morning Service. But with a more faithful observance of the Rubrics, the notion that the elements are intended to be, in some sort, an oblation or sacrifice, began, rightly or wrongly, to revive. No distinction appears to have been recognised between oblation and sacrifice until recently, when, as one may gather from incidental circumstances, the elements were presented not merely as an oblation for divine service, but as a proper sacrifice to God. Mr. Palmer, in 1832, argued for "the oblation or sacrifice" "of the elements:"* and in 1838, the "Tracts for the Times" set forth that "the doctrine of the early Church," and therefore the true doctrine, was this: that "in the Eucharist, an oblation or sacrifice was made by the Church to God, under the form of His creatures of bread and wine, according to our Blessed Lord's holy institution, in memory of His Cross and Passion"; and this they believed to be the "pure offering" or sacrifice which the prophet Malachi foretold that the Gentiles should offer; and that it was enjoined by our Lord in the words, "Do this for a memorial of me"; that it was alluded to when our Lord or St. Paul speaks of a Christian "altar,"† and was typified by the Passover, which was both a sacrifice and a feast upon a sacrifice: that it is "a commemorative oblation or sacrifice" by which "they presented to the ALMIGHTY FATHER the symbols and memorials of the meritorious Death and Passion of His Only Begotten and Well-beloved Son": that "they first offered to God His gifts, in commemoration of that His inestimable benefit, and placed them upon His altar here, to be received, and presented on the Heavenly Altar by Him, our High Priest: and then trusted to receive them back, conveying to them the life-giving Body and Blood."‡

But in the advancing views of the Eucharistic sacrifice, this doctrine of the oblation or sacrifice of the elements before consecration seems to have become much less important and prominent. According, indeed, to the "Kalendar of the Eng-

* Origines Liturgicæ, c. IV. Lect. x. vol. ii. pp. 78. 86.

† Matt. v. 23; Heb. xiii. 10.

‡ Tracts for the Times, No. 81, pp. 4, 5.

lish Church," the bread and wine are "offered,"* and according to the "Priest's Prayer-book," they are both an "oblation" and a "sacrifice prepared for God's Holy Name."† But according to Archdeacon Wilberforce, the bare elements are "nothing but an empty sign, which cannot seriously be looked upon as a becoming offering": and "the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice" has no "substratum," but in alliance with "the doctrine of the Real Presence:"¹⁰² so that, in his view, the unconsecrated elements could be neither oblation nor sacrifice. It appears, however, that the elements are offered as a sacrifice: as it is supposed that our Liturgy and Catholic doctrine and practice require it. But "The Eucharistic Sacrifice," or "The Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist," is now the consecrated bread and wine, having under them the real presence of our Lord's glorified humanity; the elements remaining in their own nature and substance, but having under their form the real objective presence of the body and blood of Christ.¹⁰³

IV. The system of the Church of Rome may be more briefly described. It has a separate oblation of the unconsecrated elements, and the bread is offered as an "immaculate host," and with the wine, as "a sacrifice prepared for God's holy name." And after the consecration, by which the substance of the elements is changed, "the whole substance of the bread" being "changed into the Body, and the whole substance of the wine, into the Blood of Jesus Christ,"‡ they are offered as "a pure host, holy, and immaculate; the holy bread of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation."‡

These four theories, then, however antagonistic to each other, concur in setting forth a material sacrifice in the

* For 1867, p. 37.

† P. 12, ed. 2.

¹⁰² Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, 1853, c. xi. p. 347. Archdeacon Wilberforce, however, admits the sacrifice of the unconsecrated elements. He says: "allowing the Holy Eucharist to be a sacrifice, what is the thing offered—is it the *sacramentum* only, or the *res sacramenti* also? is it mere bread and wine, or the Body of Christ? Now it may readily be admitted that the *sacramentum* is offered: the bread and wine, as a sort of first-fruits of creation, are brought as an offering to God, with a view of being employed in this solemn service, and are thus devoted with various preliminary rites, as being the means which are required by the priest according to the order of Melchisedek, for the celebration of His ritual. And on this account the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist may be fitly spoken of as a memorial of Christ. For as the external part of this ordinance is described by the Fathers as a type or figure of the inward reality, by which it is accompanied; so the oblation of the *sacramentum* serves as a memorial of Him who is really offered as the *res sacramenti*, or thing signified."—Ch. ii. p. 373.

¹⁰³ The presence of our Lord's glorified humanity, and the presence of his body and blood, are treated as identical: although, as will be shown, there is a clear and most important distinction between them.

‡ Rock's Hierurgia, 1851, pp. 18, 19, 165, 31.

Eucharist, a sacrifice of the bread and wine either before or after consecration, or both before and after it. And now comes the question, what sanction is to be found for the assertion of a material sacrifice in Holy Scripture, and in the doctrine of the primitive Church.

CHAPTER IV.

DEFINITION OF SACRIFICE.

THOSE who have not studied the subject would be surprised to find, and many who have studied it have failed to notice, how very little authority is found in Holy Scripture for the doctrine of a material sacrifice in the Eucharist. Whatever places may be produced in incidental illustration, there are only five places to be alleged in direct proof of the doctrine; and from these it does not by any means logically or necessarily follow.

But before we enter upon an examination of these passages, it is necessary to ascertain what a material sacrifice is; for though many authors have given definitions of sacrifice, most have forgotten their own definitions, or have constructed them purposely to suit their own theories; and the argument has proceeded to a false conclusion, or has been, in reality, a mere contest about words.

Now, it is not of sacrifice in general, as some have thought,¹⁰⁴ that we are to seek the definition; but of material sacrifice, according to the sense and use of Scripture. Heathen sacrifices do not enter into consideration here.

First of all, then, a sacrifice is a thing offered or rendered up to God, or the act of offering or rendering it up to Him. Secondly, the thing offered is either visible and material, or invisible and spiritual: visible and material as a lamb; invisible and spiritual, as praise.* And the act of offering is either visible and ceremonial, or invisible and spiritual as the offering itself. Thirdly, the material thing offered is not anything whatsoever indifferently, but one or more of certain things presented by Divine appointment. And fourthly, the

¹⁰⁴ As Dr. Hickes, who says: "a sacrifice is a material thing solemnly brought, or presented and offered to any god, according to the rites of any religion."—*Christian Prieſthood*. Works, ii. 167.

* Heb. xiii. 15.

thing offered as a material sacrifice is slain, if it be a living thing; or if an inanimate thing, the "memorial"¹⁰⁵ of it was burnt, and the whole was thus an "offering of the Lord made by fire."¹⁰⁶ In both cases life or being was destroyed.

This was the difference between all material sacrifices, and all other offerings. Mede rightly says that "every sacrifice is an oblation or offering; but every offering is not a sacrifice":¹⁰⁷ for though every sacrifice was offered, every offering was not sacrificed. Sacrifices, indeed, were burnt wholly or in part; but not all sacrifices: for the Passover was not burnt, and therefore the burning of the sacrifice only distinguished one or more kinds of sacrifices from others. But in the case of all material sacrifices, without exception, life or being was destroyed.

And this had a special signification. The rule of sacrifices was, that the offering must be one or more of certain kinds of living things: * though, of necessity, there was one exception. If a man were "not able to bring" any of the appointed living things, "then he" was to "bring for his offering" a quantity "of fine flour"; and this being delivered to the priest, "a memorial thereof" was to be burnt "on the altar, according to the offerings made by fire unto the Lord." † The sacrifice, therefore, consisted of things that either had life, or sustained man's life:¹⁰⁸ and these had all one thing in common,—that

¹⁰⁵ The memorial was a handful or portion of the meat-offering (Lev. ii. 2, v. 12): the rest of the offering being a portion for the priests.

¹⁰⁶ "Omnia omnino, quæ in Scriptura dicuntur sacrificia, necessario destruenda erant; si viventia, per occisionem; si inanima solida, ut simila, et sal, et thus, per combustionem; si liquida, ut sanguis, vinum, et aqua, per effusionem."—"Ad verum sacrificium requiritur, ut id quod offertur Deo in sacrificium, plane destruat."—Bellarmin. de Euch. I. ii. 716, 717.

"All things which are called sacrifices in Scripture were necessarily to be destroyed; if living things, by slaughter; if inanimate substances, as flour, and salt, and frankincense, by burning; if liquid, as blood, wine, and water, by effusion.—For a true sacrifice it is required that that which is offered to God should be wholly destroyed."

"The law of sacrifice, in its highest and most absolute enunciation, was that 'without shedding of blood,' without a death by blood, 'there was no remission.' The sole exception to this was, that fruits of the earth, provided their organism was entirely, or by a representative part, destroyed by fire, might in certain cases work the same effects."—Archdeacon Freeman's Principles of Div. Service, ii. 24.

¹⁰⁷ Christian Sacrifice, c. 7. Works, 1664, i. So Bellarmine:—

"Licet omne sacrificium oblatio sit, non tamen omnis oblatio sacrificium. Sacrificium enim præter oblationem requirit mutationem et consumptionem rei, quæ offertur, quam non requirit simplex oblatio."—De Missa, I. ii. p. 715.

* Lev. i. 2, 10, 14.

† Lev. v. 11, 12.

¹⁰⁸ "Ea enim quæ in sacrificium offerebantur, sunt illa, quæ sunt necessaria ad sustentandam humanam vitam."—Aquinas, 1a. 102, 3.

"Though every sacrifice be an oblation, yet every oblation is not a sacrifice. For a sacrifice requires, over and above an oblation, a change or consumption of the thing which is offered, which a simple oblation does not require."

they were such things as were appointed for man's food to sustain his life; in which respect, indeed, the inanimate offering was the more excellent, though less significant: for in bread is the "sustenance" of man; it is his "staff" and "stay;" it "strengtheneth man's heart," and by it he lives.*

Now all sacrifices were on account of sin. If not all offered specially for sin, they were all because of sin. And for sin man's life is forfeited to God, for He has said: "the soul that sinneth it shall die."† But when the sinner offered sacrifice according to God's appointment, by rendering up to Him the life or being of the victim, it was accepted for him as "an atonement for" his sins; and they were "forgiven."‡ The victim suffered the penalty which the offerer had incurred: life or being was offered for life: the one life was accepted for the other: and by the death of the victim the sinner's life was saved.

The offering of sacrifice was a virtual confession of sin, and that "the wages of sin is death": § it was a virtual profession of faith in God, and of hope that He would be merciful to the sinner. But the offering was accompanied by an expressly appointed and significant action. The offerer was commanded to "put his hand upon the head of the victim,"¹⁰⁹ which, according to Maimonides,¹¹⁰ he was to do "with all his might": and then

* Acts vii. 11; Ps. cv. 16; Isa. iii. 1; Ps. civ. 15; Dent. viii. 3.

† Gen. ii. 17; Ezek. xviii. 4.

‡ Lev. i. 4; iv. 20, 26, 31, 35.

§ Rom. vi. 23; Lev. i. 4; iii. 2, 8, 13; iv. 4, 15, 24, 29.

¹⁰⁹ "The rite of sacrifices had these several ends: 1. To represent, and to be a memorial of, the great sacrifice of Christ, who should once be offered up in behalf of sinners: 2. To lecture unto them the desert of sin and sinners; death and fire, in the death and firing of the sacrifice before their eyes: 3. To acknowledge their goods received from God, in offering up unto Him something of all they had: 4. To be a matter of worship and religion in those times of ceremoniousness; wherein all did acknowledge their homage to God, and true believers acted their faith in Christ's sufferings: 5. To be signs of repentance, and pledges of expiation."—Lightfoot, Temple Service in the days of our Saviour, c. viii.

Aquinas says that "the offering of sacrifices was a kind of public protestation of sin: *Sacrificiorum oblatio erat quedam protestatio peccati.*"—II. q. 54, 3, 3m.

¹¹⁰ "Porro homo manus imponebat capiti animantis,—ut fateretur victimam illam vicem obire suam, pro se mactari, et illius sanguinem inspergi altaribus, ubi sanguinem et vitam suam profundi jus erat."—Exordium Comment. in Lev. iv. De Sacrificiis, Lond. 1683, 301.

"Moreover the man put his hand upon the head of the animal,—to confess that that victim was put in his stead, was slain for him, and that its blood was sprinkled upon the altar, where it was just that his own blood and life should be poured out."

"Some chosen animal, precious to the repenting criminal, who deprecates, or is supposed to be obnoxious to the Deity, who is to be appeased, was offered up and slain at the altar, in an action, which, in all languages, when translated into words, speaks to this purpose: 'I confess my transgressions at thy footstool, O my God! and with the deepest contrition, implore thy pardon, confessing that I deserve death for these my offences.' The latter part of the confession was more forcibly expressed by the *action* of striking the devoted animal, and depriving it of life; which, when put into words,

the victim was to be killed. It is not to be supposed that the imposition of hands on the victim was a mere dumb ceremony; but that it was always accompanied by words expressing that which the action symbolised. And what this was, is put beyond doubt by the direction, that on the day of atonement, when the High Priest laid "his hands upon the live goat," he should "confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat,"—and the goat should "bear upon him all their iniquities." * The laying on of hands, then, put upon the head of the victim all the confessed sins of the offerer, and therefore he had to confess his sins, if he desired to make atonement for them, and would hope to have them forgiven. And so Maimonides says, that the worshipper "confesseth upon the sin-offering the iniquity of sin."

The ceremony of the imposition of hands was not used or appointed in the Passover; for this was not a sacrifice for any sin in particular, nor for the actual sins of the nation. It was for all, both those who had not, and those who had, actually transgressed; for the infant who could not transgress, as well as for the adult who had transgressed. It was made because of sin, the common sin of men: but was not appointed to make atonement for the particular sins of any one person, or for the offences of the people.

In the trespass offering, also, there is no laying of hands upon the victim, but the offerer had to "confess that he had sinned in that thing." †

The material sacrifices, then, of Scripture, were a symbolical confession of sin, and were accompanied by an actual confession: they were a symbolical acknowledgment of its demerit, and deprecation of its penalty. The sacrifice virtually declared that the offerer had sinned; that he had become guilty of death, that he proposed the life of the victim for his own life; and that he hoped and trusted, through the mercy of the Most High, that his sacrifice would be accepted on his altar, and his sins would be forgiven.

The sum of all, then, is this,—that the material sacrifices of Scripture differ from all other oblations, in that there was

concluded in this manner; 'And I own that I myself deserve the death which I now inflict on this animal.'—Warburton, *Div. Leg.*, Book ix. c. 2.

* Lev. xvi. 21, 22.

† Lev. v. 5.

either destruction of the life of the victim by bloodshedding, or destruction of the being of the offering by fire:¹¹¹ that the sacrifices were a symbolical confession of sin, and required an actual confession of it; that they were a symbolical acknowledgment of its demerit, deprecation of the penalty which was due to it, and profession of hope and trust in the promised mercy of God.

From these considerations, we must define a material sacrifice to be one or more of certain living or inanimate things appointed by Almighty God, and offered to Him by the destruction of life by blood-shedding, or of being by fire. And by this or some other equivalent definition, must the question be determined, whether we do or do not offer a material sacrifice in the Eucharist.

Now the affirmative is maintained on the strength of other definitions, which being granted, the conclusion asserting a material sacrifice must follow. Such definitions are, therefore, now to be examined.

These definitions may all be called Post-Tridentine, and are fashioned with a view to the controversies of that period. St. Augustine, indeed, has two well-known definitions of sacrifice: but they are far wide of the present question. He says that "a true sacrifice is every work which is done in order that by a holy fellowship we may abide in God:" but this refers to the act of offering, and not to the thing offered, and is a definition of oblation and not specifically of material sacrifice. So also when he says: "a visible sacrifice is the sacrament of an invisible sacrifice;"¹¹² though he refers to some visible, external, material thing offered; yet the definition covers all oblations, whether sacrificed or not: for every offering is a sign of an invisible sacrifice.

The definition, again, of Aquinas, which makes sacrifice to be "something done for the honour properly due to God in order to appease Him,"¹¹³ refers to the act of offering, and embraces oblations and sacrifices alike.

¹¹¹ Theophylact says: "Sacrifices are the offerings by blood and flesh; or, more accurately this, all things which are offered by fire. For *θυσία* is properly from *θύεσθαι*, which is, to send forth smoke. *Θυσίαι εἰσὶν αἱ δι' αἵματος καὶ κρεῶν προσαγωγῆς ἢ τόγῃ ἀκριβέστερον, παντὰ τὰ διὰ πυρὸς θυμιώμενα. Θυσία γὰρ κυρίως παρὰ τὸ θύεσθαι, ὃ ἐστὶ, θυμιᾶσθαι.*"—In cap. viii. ad Heb. p. 949.

¹¹² "Verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur ut sancta societate inhæreamus Deo.—Sacrificium ergo visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum est."—De Civ. Dei, x. 6. 5.

¹¹³ Summa Theol. III. q. 48. art. 3. con.: "Sacrificium proprie dicitur aliquid factum in honorem proprie Deo debitum ad eum placandum."

Another of his definitions is: "Sacrifices are properly so named, when anything is done about things which have been offered to God: as that animals were slain and burnt: that bread is broken, and is eaten, and is blessed:—and this the name itself intimates. For sacrifice is called from this, that the man does some sacred thing. But it is rightly named oblation, when anything is offered to God, although nothing be done about it."¹¹⁴ This definition is obviously constructed for the purpose of supporting the doctrine of a material sacrifice in the Eucharist. But, although a writer in the *Theologian* and *Ecclesiastic*,* seems to refer to it as a decisive authority, it will not bear a moment's examination. A sacrifice, let us say, is "when anything is done about things which have been offered to God." Let it be granted, then, that bread is offered to God: but let one of many possible things be done about it, as that it be thrown into a river: is it then a sacrifice? The notion is absurd.

Again, the definition says that it is a sacrifice, when "bread is broken, and is eaten, and is blessed": which is totally to reverse the order of the Sacrament, and of the Roman sacrifice. The bread is first blessed, and then it is broken, and last of all it is eaten. But if it were eaten before it is blessed: then, that which is received is mere bread only; and there is neither transubstantiation nor sacrifice, but in the stomach of the communicant.

The question whether the bread is sacrificed by being eaten, will be treated more fully, when we come to Johnson's definition.

Bellarmino, however, attempts a very full and precise definition. He says: "A sacrifice is an external oblation made to God alone, by which for the acknowledgment of human infirmity, and the profession of the Divine Majesty, some thing sensible and permanent is consecrated by a legitimate minister in a mystical rite, and is transmuted." And in explanation of this transmutation, he adds: "because it is required for a true sacrifice, that that which is offered to God for a sacrifice, should be wholly destroyed, that is, should be so changed, that it should cease to be that which it was before."¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ "Sacrificia proprie dicuntur, quando circa res Deo oblatas aliquid fit: sicut quod animalia occidebantur, et comburebantur: quod panis frangitur, et comeditur, et benedicitur: et hoc ipsum nomen sonat. Nam sacrificium dicitur ex hoc quod homo facit aliquid sacrum. Oblatio autem directe dicitur cum Deo aliquid offertur etiamsi nihil circa ipsum fiat."—II. 2dæ, q. 85, art. 3.

* January 1850, pp. 40, &c.

¹¹⁵ De Missa, I. ii.: "Sacrificium est oblatio externa facta soli Deo, qua ad agnitionem

But this definition either excludes the sacrifices of the Old Testament, for there is no proof that they were consecrated; or it assumes that they were "consecrated by a mystical rite" before they were offered. In the one case, the definition totally fails; in the other its validity depends on the proof of the fact assumed. The proof proposed is this: the etymological signification of the word to sacrifice is to make sacred,¹¹⁶ to consecrate: and the consecration, moreover, was accomplished by the mystical rite of "the imposition of hands upon the victim, or of the elevation of the oblation."¹¹⁷ But if to make sacred or to consecrate, was to sacrifice, then everything dedicated or offered to God was sacrificed whether the life or being of the offering was destroyed or not: and if, again, the consecration, and therefore the sacrifice, was effected by the imposition of hands or the elevation of the offering, the sacrifice was made before its life or being was destroyed: which is as much as to say, that the victim was sacrificed before it was slain, that the sacrifice was made before it was sacrificed.

Nor is there any proof that the victim was consecrated by the laying on of the offerer's hands. We have seen that the signification of the "mystical rite" of the hands being laid on the head of the victim, was, that it was made to bear the sins of the offerer which had been confessed by him. But it is a mere assumption that the victim was consecrated by that rite. And even if it was consecrated by it; yet to say, as the argument requires, that the victim was sacrificed by the offerer laying his hands upon its head, is to utter an evident absurdity. Neither was the victim consecrated by any elevation. The rite or ceremony of elevation, was not confined to sacrifices,* which it must have been, if to elevate or heave were to consecrate, and to consecrate were to sacrifice. It was used in the offering of tithes, and of tribute of the spoils taken in war; † with certain parts of sacrifices already offered and made; ‡ and with the meat offering which was added to certain

humanæ infirmitatis, et professionem Divinæ Majestatis a legitimo ministro res aliqua sensibilis et permanens ritu mystico consecratur. et transmutatur.—Quia ad verum sacrificium requiritur, ut id quod offertur Deo in sacrificium, plane destruat, id est, ita mutetur, ut desinat esse id quod ante erat.

¹¹⁶ Aquinas also says: "Sacrificium dicitur ex hoc quod homo facit aliquid sacrum."
—II. ii. q. 85, 3.

¹¹⁷ "Ista autem consecratio et dedicatio semper fiebat in lege veteri certo ritu, et cerimonia mysterium continente, ut impositione manuum super victimam, vel elevatione oblationis in altum. Et in hoc distinguitur sacrificium a simplici oblatione, quæ non requirit ex se ullam ejusmodi mysticam consecrationem."—Ibid.

* Num. xviii. 24, 28; xxxi. 26–29, 41.

† Num. xv. 19, 21; xviii. 24, 28; xxxi. 29, 41.

‡ Exod. xxix. 24, 26, 27; Lev. x. 15.

sacrifices.* But the elevation or heaving of the offering did not signify consecration to the Lord; for the whole victim, of which parts were heaved, had been already offered to Him: and the heaving or the waving of those parts showed that they belonged to the priests according to the Divine appointment, and appropriated them to their use.¹¹⁸

Nor, again, is there any real foundation in Holy Scripture for the assertion that "it is required for a true sacrifice that that which is offered to God for a sacrifice should be wholly destroyed." Life or being, indeed, was wholly destroyed in all sacrifices; but the matter of the sacrifice was wholly destroyed only in one kind of sacrifice. The sacrifice of the Passover was to be wholly eaten; and all the other sacrifices, save one kind, were to be partly eaten by the priests and their families, or by the offerers and their friends. If it be said that to eat is to destroy, this is to use the word destroy in a very unusual and untrue meaning: and to apply it to the burning of sacrifices by fire, and to the consumption of them by eating, is to abuse it by a double sense. And again, the explanation of a sacrifice being wholly destroyed, as meaning that it "should be so changed that it should cease to be that which it was before," is contrary to the fact; for the meat offering was not so changed, and a lamb, offered in sacrifice, is still a lamb after its life has been destroyed. It has not "ceased to be that which it was before" it was sacrificed. It was a living lamb: it is now a dead lamb: it is a lamb still.

It may be remarked also, that although the definition before us was purposely constructed to fit in with the doctrines of transubstantiation and of the sacrifice of the Mass, it is altogether destructive of them. The definition, it is true, would make a sacrifice of the elements by their elevation: for in the Roman Missal, they are elevated and offered,¹¹⁹ before they are consecrated by the words of the institution, and, we may say, in another and distinct part of the Mass; their elevation and

* Lev. vii. 11-14.

¹¹⁸ Lev. x. 14, 15; Num. xviii. 8-12, 24. The heave offering and the wave offering differed in this—that the former was agitated up and down; the latter from side to side: and one part of the same sacrifice was sometimes heaved, and another part was waved. Exod. xxix. 27; Lev. vii. 30, 32, 34.

¹¹⁹ "Accipit Patenam cum Hostia, et ambabus manibus ad pectus eam elevatam tenens.—Accipit manu dextra Calicem discoopertum; et stans ante medium Altaris, ipsum ambabus manibus elevatum tenens."—"Suscipe, sancte Pater, hanc immaculatam Hostiam, quam ego indignus famulus tuus offero tibi.—Offerimus tibi, Domine, Calicem salutaris.—Oblatis, quæsumus, Domine, placare muneribus."—Missale Romanum, Antverpiæ, 1657, De Ritibus celebrandi Missam, vii. 2, 5; Ibid. pp. 297, 298; Rock's Hierurgia, pp. 18, 19, 24.

oblation being in the "Ordo Missæ," and the words of the institution being recited in the "Canon Missæ."* And if elevation be "a mystical rite" by which an oblation is consecrated; and if "to consecrate" is "to sacrifice": then the elements are sacrificed by this elevation. And again, if they be a true sacrifice, as the definition assumes; and if it be "required for a true sacrifice that that which is offered to God for a sacrifice should be wholly destroyed;" and if to "be wholly destroyed" is to "be so changed as to cease to be that which it was before:" then by the elevation of the elements which consecrates, and therefore sacrifices, them, they are "wholly destroyed," and so "changed that" they have "ceased to be that which they were before." What are they, then, changed into? the *individuum vagum*, which some have fancied "This" in the words of the institution to mean? or are they become, "by anticipation,"¹²⁰ "an unspotted Host or Victim"? What is the change, amounting to total destruction, which they have undergone?

But that the elements are a sacrifice, and have therefore "ceased to be that which they were before," according to Bellarmine's definition, is irreconcilable with the definition of the Council of Trent, which declares, that, not some unknown thing, or the substance of some unknown thing under the form of bread and wine, but, "the whole substance of the bread is converted into the substance of the body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine is converted into the substance of His blood:" and this, not by the sacrifice of the bread and wine, but by their formal consecration with the words of our Lord at the institution of the Sacrament.¹²¹ The Cardinal's definition makes a sacrifice of the elements by their elevation, and a change in them by which they have "ceased to be that which they were before": the Council of Trent has it, that, notwithstanding the sacrifice, they are not changed, but are still bread and wine up to the very moment of consecration by our Lord's words.

And there is much more important variance between the

* Missale Rom. pp. 297, 360.

¹²⁰ Dr. Rock, *ibid.* p. 75, note 59. "Anticipation" is a very convenient figure for divines of Rome. Husenbeth said, that "the body which Christ gave was by anticipation his glorified body, which was *capable of being in many places at once*," &c. Defence against Blanco White, Lond. 1826, p. 79.

¹²¹ "Hæc Synodus declarat, per consecrationem panis et vini, conversionem fieri totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi, Domini nostri, et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus."—Sess. 13, c. 4. "Sequitur nunc ut de forma, qua ad consecrandum panem uti oporteat agatur.—Itaque a sanctis evangelistis, Matthæo et Luca, itemque ab Apostolo docemur, illam esse formam, *Hoc est corpus meum.*—*Hic est calix sanguinis mei*," &c.—Cat. Conc. Trid. II. iv. 20, 21.

Cardinal's definition and the doctrine of his Church. That doctrine is that the whole substance of the elements is changed into the body and blood of Christ: that "immediately after consecration, the true body of our Lord, and His true blood exist under the species of the bread and wine, together with His soul and Divinity:" and that "a true and proper sacrifice," "one and the same sacrifice, which was offered upon the cross," is offered in the Mass to God; the only difference being between "a bloody and an unbloody sacrifice,"¹²² or "in the manner of offering" it: in short, that our Lord Jesus Christ Himself is offered as a sacrifice, is immolated in the Mass, to God. But by Bellarmine's definition, that which is offered as a sacrifice is "wholly destroyed, that is, has ceased to be that which it was before": and therefore, Christ our Lord being offered, has ceased to be that which He was before. He is changed by the sacrifice, and his body and blood are no longer his body and blood. By the very act of the sacrifice, the sacrifice made of Christ Himself,¹²³ the Immutable is "transmuted"; He is "wholly destroyed," and ceases to be what He was, if Bellarmine's definition be right. But it is impossible for Him who is "the same for ever," to be changed or to cease to be what He is: and, therefore, the definition is wrong, as well as at variance with the doctrines of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass.

And yet again, the definition before us would overturn the very sacrifice on the cross. It decides that a true sacrifice must be "wholly destroyed," so "that it should cease to be that which it was before." Now our Lord could not be "wholly destroyed," nor "cease to be that which He was before": and therefore, if the definition were right, He could not be a true sacrifice. But inasmuch as He has "put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself," and "by one offering hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified;"* and inasmuch as this offering "is that which was figured by various similitudes of sacrifices in

¹²² "Si quis dixerit, in Missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium; aut quod offerri non sit aliud, quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari; anathema sit."—*Conc. Trid. sess. 22, can. 1.* "Una enim eademque est hostia, idemque nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio, qui seipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, sola offerendi ratione diversa."—*Ibid. c. 2.* "Unum itaque et idem sacrificium esse fatemur et haberi debet, quod in Missa peragitur et quod in cruce oblatum est, quemadmodum una et eadem hostia, Christus videlicet Dominus noster, qui seipsum in ara crucis semel tantummodo cruentum immolavit.—Neque enim cruenta et incruenta hostia due sunt hostiæ."

¹²³ "Quid nobis sperandum de eo sacrificio, in quo ille ipse immolatur atque offertur?"—*Cat. Con. Trid. II. 75.*

* *Heb. ix. 26; x. 14.*

the time of nature and of the law ; since, as the consummation and perfection of them all, it embraces all the good things which were signified by them ;”¹²⁴ and no other sacrifice could put away sin : * his sacrifice was beyond all others a true and proper sacrifice ; or rather, it is the only true and proper sacrifice. It alone fulfilled the will of God, and “ obtained eternal redemption for ” “ all that come unto God by Him : ” and no sacrifice which men can make is acceptable to God, but through it. †

It would be needless to express the conclusion necessarily to be drawn from these remarks, but for form's sake : namely, that the definition of sacrifice put forth by this great champion of Romish doctrine, is utterly inconsistent with the sacrifices of Scripture, and is destructive not only of the doctrines which it was constructed to support, but even of the very sacrifice of our Lord Himself upon the cross.

I have devoted so much space to the definition of Cardinal Bellarmine, because it seems to be the model on which writers of his Church usually frame their definitions :¹²⁵ and because it has been imitated by a very learned writer of the Church of England.

Mede, to whom it appears that the theory of a material sacrifice in our Church is chiefly owing, proposes these definitions : “ A sacrifice is an offering whereby the offerer is made partaker of his God's table, in token of covenant and friendship with him, &c., or more explicitly thus ; An offering unto the Divine Majesty of that which is given for the food of man, that the offerer partaking thereof might, as by way of pledge, be certified of his acceptation into covenant and fellowship with

¹²⁴ “ Hæc denique illa est, quæ per varias sacrificiorum, naturæ et legis tempore, similitudines figurabatur ; utpote, quæ bona omnia, per illa significata, velut illorum omnium consummatio et perfectio complectitur.”—*Conc. Trid. sess. 22, c. 1.*

* Heb. x. 4.

† Heb. x. 8-10 ; ix. 12 ; vii. 25.

¹²⁵ “ Sacrificium stricte et proprie dictum—definiri potest : ‘ Oblatio externa rei sensibilis et propria existentia permanentis, soli Deo facta, a legitimo Ministro, ad recognoscendum supremum ejus in omnes creaturas dominium : et eo ritu ut res oblata destruat, vel saltem immutatur.’ Delahogue, *De Eucharistia*, ii. c. 1, *Dubl. 1828*, p. 234. “ Sacrificium proprie et stricte sumptum pro actione sacrificativa, de quo hic agimus, sic definitur : Oblatio externa, quæ res aliqua sensibilis et permanens per legitimum Ministrum consecratur, perimitur aut aliter immutatur in protestationem supremi Dei in res omnes creatas domini, nostræque erga eum subjectionis.”—*Dens, Theologia, Dubl. 1832, v. 354.* “ Exterior sacrifice, according to the proper acceptation of the term, is an offering or oblation of some sensible thing, by a lawfully appointed minister, in order to acknowledge, by the destruction, or, at least, the change effected in the offering, the majesty and sovereign power of God : to proclaim his absolute dominion over everything created :—and while we make a contrite declaration of our sinfulness, and confess our weakness, to deprecate his wrath, and seek his favour.”—*Rock's Hierurgia*, p. 119.

his God, by eating and drinking at his Table." * But these definitions altogether exclude the burnt offerings, and those other sacrifices of which no part was eaten by those who offered them. There was only one kind of sacrifices, the peace offerings, of which the offerer was "made partaker" at "God's table." Mede's definitions must, therefore, be rejected as being definitions not of sacrifice, but of only one kind of sacrifice. And even with regard to this kind they are defective in one very essential point: they ignore the death of the victim of which the offerer was made partaker at "God's table." They were drawn up for the purpose of making it appear, that the bread and wine in the Eucharist are a strict and proper sacrifice made to God by the worshippers: and, therefore, since these elements are not destroyed, like as part of the meat-offerings was destroyed by fire; the destruction of life or being in the sacrifices of which the offerers partook is kept out of sight. But as another object of Mede's treatise was to show by the analogy of Patriarchal, Mosaic, and heathen sacrifices, that the elements in the Lord's Supper are not only a sacrifice, but also a Covenant feast, in which God is "the entertainer or maker of the feast, and man the conviva or guest;" he says: "to which end the viands for this sacred *Epulum* were first to be offered unto God, and so made his; that he might entertain the offerer, and not the offerer him. For we are to observe, that what the fire consumed was accounted as God's own mess, and called by himself *the meat of his fire-offerings* (Lev. iii. 11, 16, Num. xxviii. 2, 24): the rest was for his guests." † Yet even here he forgets the distinction which he himself had laid down between oblation and sacrifice; and because the bread and wine are, or may be, an oblation offered to God, he assumes that they are therefore a sacrifice. He is blind to the critical point of the analogy, namely, that the sacrifices of which the offerers partook were offered to God by the destruction of life or being: whereas there is nothing of the kind done in the Eucharist. There is no destruction of the bread or wine in that Sacrament.

The definition of sacrifice proposed by Johnson, the author of *The Unbloody Sacrifice*, is as follows. "Sacrifice is, 1. Some material thing, either animate, or inanimate, offered to God, 2. for the acknowledging the dominion, and other attributes of

* *Christian Sacrifice*, c. vii. Works, Lond. i. 470.

† P. 471.

God, or for procuring Divine blessings, especially remission of sin, 3, upon a proper altar (which yet is rather necessary for the external decorum than the internal perfection of the sacrifice), 4, by a proper officer, and with agreeable rites, 5, and consumed or otherwise disposed of in such a manner as the Author of the sacrifice has appointed." ¹²⁶

Now this purposely excludes all spiritual sacrifices. He does not say, "a material sacrifice is something animate or inanimate offered to God"; but, "sacrifice is some material thing": and he says in the next page: "that nothing can properly be called a sacrifice, but some material thing offered to God." And in this he follows Bellarmine, who makes sacrifice "an external oblation" of "some sensible and permanent thing":* and although acknowledging with St. Augustine that there are invisible as well as visible sacrifices; that a visible sacrifice is a sacrament of an invisible sacrifice; that the invisible is more noble and better than the visible; that the invisible is pleasing to God without the visible; and that the visible is not pleasing to God without the invisible; yet strangely contends that "the name of sacrifice does not properly agree with an invisible oblation, but only to one that is visible and external." ¹²⁷

But, assuredly, it is a very illogical, unreasonable, and inconsistent style of argument, to allow invisible sacrifices, and to show how much nobler and better they are than visible sacrifices; and yet to deny them the name.

Johnson, however, asserts that invisible oblations are sacrifices, only "in a figurative and improper sense;" ¹²⁸ and contends that they must have visible and material sacrifices joined with them "to enforce" them and "to render them" the more effectual and prevailing with God." Whereas the Holy Scrip-

¹²⁶ Works, Oxford, 1847, i. 71, introduction. Spencer has: "Munera oblata Deo, et in illius honorem solemniter consumpta," p. 640. Outram: "προσφορά, rite consumpta," p. 81.

* See his definition in p. 334.

¹²⁷ "Duplex enim oblatio, et largo modo, duplex sacrificium distingui potest, ut S. Augustinus distinguit, lib. 10 de civitate Dei, cap. 5, invisibile, sive internum, et visibile, sive externum. Invisibile est pia voluntas, quæ Divinæ Majestati se et sua omnia offert: visibile autem est testificatio quædam externa interni affectus. Quare ibidem Augustinus definiens visibile sacrificium invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum esse dicit. Quamvis autem invisibilis oblatio sit nobilior, et melior visibili, et placeat Deo invisibilis sine visibili; visibilis sine invisibili Deo non placeat: tamen nomen, et ratio sacrificii proprie non convenit invisibili oblationi, sed solum visibili et externæ, ut nos in definitione posuimus."—De Missa, I. ii.

¹²⁸ "There is in Scripture mention made of spiritual sacrifices."—"I deny not but it [prayer] may be, and is, called so by ancient writers in a figurative and improper sense, as likewise a 'contrite spirit' is called a sacrifice by David."—II. 155, 152 Part 2, c. ii. sect. 2.

tures represent spiritual oblations as not only sacrifices, but sacrifices in the highest sense. "The sacrifices of God are a troubled spirit." "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." "To do good, and to communicate, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." *

Most true it is, that no sacrifices, spiritual or material; no prayers, or praises, no contrition, no devotion of one's self to God, can be acceptable in themselves to Him. There is only one sacrifice that can enforce them, or render them effectual or prevailing with God. They are "acceptable to Him" only, as St. Peter says, "by Jesus Christ." And therefore we may well allow, that material sacrifices offered in faith under the old dispensations, served and were necessary to make spiritual sacrifices effectual and prevailing with God. But the bare visible sacrifices, without the invisible, were not pleasing to God: they were no true sacrifices; although they were requisite to express invisible sacrifices, and to render these acceptable through that one Sacrifice not yet seen, which the visible external sacrifices symbolised.

This definition of Johnson, again, appears to me, as well as the definition of Bellarmine, to be opposed to the doctrine of our Lord's sacrifice upon the cross. Johnson, indeed, as we have seen,† expressly asserts that our Lord "did offer his body and blood to God when He instituted" the Eucharist; and that "there is no evidence that He did again on the cross make the oblation of his body and blood as a Priest." But if that only be a true sacrifice, as Bellarmine asserts, in which there is "an external oblation—of something sensible and permanent": then it would follow, that our Lord's death was no true sacrifice, since He offered, not any external thing but "Himself."‡ And if a sacrifice must be "consumed," or if it must be "otherwise disposed of," by which must be meant "destroyed in some other way than by being consumed, so as at least to be no more what it was": then it would follow, that as the oblation of our Lord Himself, as the soul and the body § which He offered for sin, were neither consumed nor destroyed in any other way; his oblation was not a sacrifice.

* Ps. li. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 5; Heb. xiii. 15, 16. It may here be noticed, that although all material oblations are not sacrifices, yet all spiritual oblations are sacrifices.

† P. 316.

‡ Heb. vii. 27; ix. 14, 25.

§ Isa. liii. 10; John x. 15; Heb. x. 10.

Whereas He gave Himself, but was not destroyed: He offered his soul and his body, but they were neither "consumed" nor otherwise destroyed. That his soul was "otherwise disposed of," by descending into Hades; and that his body was "otherwise disposed of," by being buried: were consequent upon his sacrifice: but the sacrifice was complete, when He said "It is finished," and "yielded up the ghost." * His sacrifice was complete and perfect on the cross: for on it He was slain, was killed, and yielded up his life. And in this was his sacrifice; not in any disposal which was consequently made of that which He offered.

Johnson, moreover, following up his definition, contends that because some sacrifices under the law consisted only of a meat offering, that is, of flour with oil and incense; and because, with the meat offering joined with other sacrifices, wine was used for a drink offering: that therefore bread and wine were a sacrifice under the law, and consequently are a sacrifice under the Gospel. But first, it is not the fact that bread and wine alone were ever offered as a sacrifice under the institutions of Moses. That bread, either in its unmade condition of flour, or made into cakes, might be offered, is true; but it was always salted with salt and mingled or anointed with oil, † except it was a sin-offering, when the oil was to be omitted. And that wine was used for a drink offering, is also true: but it was always with a meat offering of flour in some way, mingled with oil; and this with some animal sacrifice. ‡

And again, if it were ever so certain that bread and wine were a sacrifice under the law; it would by no means follow that they are therefore a sacrifice under the Gospel: unless it were demonstrated for a certainty, that whatever was a sacrifice under the dispensation of Moses, was also, or might be, a sacrifice under the dispensation of Christ. But this, at least so far as I am aware, never has been, and never can be, done. One kind of sacrifices, indeed, which was necessary under the law, is alike necessary under the Gospel; that is, spiritual sacrifices. But all others, all material sacrifices, have been abolished by the one sacrifice of Christ which "has perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

Both the major and the minor premisses, therefore, of the syllogism are disproved: and the argument necessarily fails.

Again, Johnson contends that inasmuch as the Passover was

* Jno. xix. 30; Mat. xxvii. 50. † Lev. ii. 1, 4, 5, 7, 13, &c., &c.

‡ Exod. xxix. 40, 41, &c., &c.; Lev. v. 11.

a sacrifice, and it was to be wholly eaten; therefore the eating of the bread and drinking of the wine in the Eucharist, answer the same purpose as the burning of the old sacrifices on the altar. But he takes no account of the facts, first, that part of every meat-offering, part of every inanimate sacrifice, was burnt on the altar: secondly, that every animate sacrifice was slain; whether the whole or part of it was burnt or not: and thirdly, that the Passover was killed, the life of the lamb taken, and its blood poured out, and so the sacrifice was made; before any part of it was eaten. The eating of the Passover was not the act of sacrifice; but was merely a feasting upon the sacrifice already offered and made. It was a consequent upon the act of sacrifice and not the act itself. Eating the bread, and drinking the wine, correspond to eating the paschal lamb, but not to the killing of the lamb, and the pouring out of its blood; nor to the slaying of any other sacrifice, nor to the burning of any sacrifice, or part of a sacrifice upon the altar.

The definition, therefore, which is constructed on the assumption, that manducation in the Eucharist corresponds to the sacrifice of the Passover, and also to the burning of part of a sacrifice,¹²⁹ is altogether fallacious: and being adapted purposely to embrace the Eucharist, notwithstanding this essential difference between it and every material sacrifice in the Scriptures: it is only to prove a thing by itself, or to argue in a circle, to use it for the proof of a material sacrifice in the Lord's Supper.

Thorndike, who maintains "that the Eucharist should be counted the sacrifice of Christ crucified, mystically, and as in a sacrament, represented to, and feasted upon by, his people"; and that "the Eucharist is a sacrifice in a general notion, in regard to the prayers which it is presented to God with," and more particularly, "in regard, first, of the offering of the elements by the people to be consecrated and made that Sacrament; secondly, in regard of the offering and presenting of it:"¹³⁰ substantially agrees with the argument I have pursued. He says: "I insist, that if sacrificing signify killing and destroying in the sacrifices of the Old Testament and the sacrifice

¹²⁹ To say that manducation is a legitimate way of consuming sacrifice, and so to make the eating of the sacrifice correspond to the altar fire, is only to make an altar of the eater's mouth.

¹³⁰ Laws of the Church, III. c. v. sect. 6. Works, Oxford, 1852, IV. 102. Service of God, &c., c. x. s. 9, vol. i. 860, 861. He gives, indeed, four reasons for calling the Eucharist a sacrifice:—1. the oblation of the elements; 2. the prayers for all estates of men; 3. the consecration; 4. the oblation to God of the bodies and souls of the receivers, pp. 106, 107, 108, 118.

of Christ upon the cross, it is not enough to make the Eucharist properly a sacrifice, that the elements are deputed to the worship of God by that change which transubstantiation importeth.—The consideration of dedicating the elements to the service of God in this Sacrament, makes them properly oblations: but the consideration of their being changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, represented as sacrificed upon the cross, makes them properly no sacrifice. In the former consideration, being properly oblations, let them be improperly sacrifices.”*

And Archdeacon Wilberforce fully agrees with this view. He says: “Now what is meant in Scripture by an offering or sacrifice? In a strict sense it is something brought before God, and presented to Him with a view of obtaining His favour. This is the etymological sense of the word *offering*; and *sacrifice*, which is often used as its equivalent, involves, in common, the further idea of the slaughter of that which is offered.”¹³¹

Many other definitions, descriptions, or accounts, of sacrifice

* Laws of the Church, III. v. 14, vol. iv. 113.

¹³¹ Doctrines of the Holy Eucharist, c. xi. Lond. 1853, 349. He goes on to say: “Now, in this full sense, [involving the further idea of the slaughter of that which is offered.] there is no sacrifice or offering which can be brought before God, except that body of Jesus Christ our Lord, with which He paid the price of our salvation. This true victim complied with every condition by which a sacrifice is characterised, that it might be presented before God as the perpetual ground of man’s acceptance.” Most truly it did fulfil every condition of a sacrifice: but that sacrifice has been offered and brought before God, by Him who alone could offer it. We may make the memorial of it, and plead it, before God: but we cannot present it before Him in any higher sense: we cannot make that sacrifice and oblation of Christ which He made once for all. It is done, and can never be done again. The Archdeacon says also: “If the Holy Eucharist, therefore, is to be called in any peculiar manner the Christian sacrifice, it can only be by reference to that one perfect propitiation upon the cross, by virtue of which we have in heaven an abiding sacrifice.” By which I understand him to mean, as he had said before, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, only because of the “inward reality” of “the Body and Blood of Christ.” For, he argues, “Let the presence of this inward part be admitted, and it is obvious that there is something in the sacrament which we can present to God.” True: it could be presented, but not immolated. We could make no sacrifice of it. “Whereas, if the Zuinglian hypothesis be adopted, there is nothing to offer in the Holy Eucharist; since it consists of nothing but an empty sign, which cannot seriously be looked upon as a becoming offering” (pp. 349, 350, 347). Yet there is as much a material sacrifice under “the Zuinglian hypothesis” as under any other, whether the Roman, or Mede’s, or Johnson’s. But the Archdeacon most clearly repudiates the idea of a material sacrifice in the Eucharist.

Again, the Archdeacon says, that in the full sense in which he had defined sacrifice as distinguished from offering, “there is no sacrifice or offering which can be brought before God, except that body of Jesus Christ our Lord, with which He paid the price of our salvation.” It is quite true, that if he meant “can” to apply to the present dispensation, there is no other sacrifice to be brought before God but that of Christ: but it is not true, if the assertion was meant generally: for the sacrifices of the old dispensation come up to the “full sense” of the definition. They were “brought before God,” they were “presented to Him with the view of obtaining His favour”; and there was “the slaughter of that which was offered.” Neither again, is it true, that there is no offering which can be brought before God, but the sacrifice of Christ unless offering be synonymous with sacrifice here, and therefore a mere tautology.

have been proposed: but I think they may be fitly classed under one or other of the definitions which have been thus reviewed. They are either definitions, descriptions, or accounts, of oblations, as including the subordinate genera or species, of oblations properly so called, of spiritual sacrifices, of material sacrifices, and the action by which any of these three species of oblations may be offered.

It will be sufficient to notice two examples. Mr. Medd proposes this definition. "The word 'sacrifice,' means the act of offering or presenting an oblation before Almighty God. This act does not necessarily imply in every case the offering of a living creature, which is sacrificed by the shedding of its blood. For instance, the offering presented by Melchisedek," [i.e. bread and wine, which he takes, somewhat illogically, for granted, had been a sacrifice offered by the King of Salem, before he brought them to Abraham.]—"Under the Levitical law, there were sacrifices of fine flour and bread, and of cakes of unleavened dough, mingled with oil, as well as of the living victims of sheep and oxen. For the essence of sacrifice as such—is not the material thing offered, but the inward disposition."* This definition, if it may be called a definition, seems to confound the act and the subject of sacrifice: and, making "the essence of sacrifice" to consist in "the inward disposition" with which it is offered, it is a definition not of sacrifice, but of the higher genus of oblations; which, whether they be things merely offered, or of things also immolated, necessarily require a suitable "inward disposition." It may be remarked, too, that it seems to assume that bread and wine, that is, bread and wine alone, were sacrifices in the ancient dispensations: an assumption which is very far from being as yet proved.

2. In the *Theologian* and *Ecclesiastic* for January 1850, there is a laboured article on "The Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist," in which the writer says: "If He has commanded us to eat and drink Bread and Wine, which has been presented before Him, in His most solemn worship, and not to satisfy our hunger, but because He is pleased to give us surpassing blessings on that condition, unquestionably such Bread and Wine is consumed in His service, although eaten and drunk by His people. And thus the Eucharist is as proper a sacrifice as any that were offered before Christ came into the world, certainly a spiritual sacrifice, but not on this account immaterial, inasmuch as it cannot be offered without the use of material

* The Church and the World.

things.”—“As in Communion we eat and drink Bread and Wine, and are made partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ: just so in sacrifice we offer Bread and Wine.” And endeavouring “to give a more exact account of sacrifice,” he cites the definitions of Aquinas before noticed, giving the second of them as follows: “Sacrifices are properly named, when anything is done about things which have been offered to God; as that animals were slain and burnt; that bread is broken, eaten, and blessed; but it is rightly called oblation when anything is offered to God although nothing be done about it.” And with this, the writer seems so far satisfied, as to make no further “endeavour to give a more exact account.” He says that “bread and wine” are “the matter of the sacrifice,” and that “the manner of their consumption—may be regarded as a necessary part of the act of sacrificing, but cannot exclude them from being a sacrifice.”* This account of sacrifice mainly agrees with the definitions of Bellarmine and Johnson, and stands or falls with them.

From this examination of various definitions of sacrifice which have been proposed at various times, we find that none of them sets forth the true notion of material sacrifice, which is to be drawn from the material sacrifices of the Old Testament. They all take for granted that the elements in the Eucharist are a sacrifice; and they are constructed for the purpose of showing that they are a sacrifice. They are merely *petitiones principii*, and attempts to prove a thing by itself. However much they may be recommended and adorned by great learning and much argumentation, they all fail to meet that one especial distinction between sacrifices and simple oblations, that in all material sacrifices, there was the destruction of life by bloodshedding, or of being by fire.

* Pp. 37, 39, 40, 41.

CHAPTER V.

PASSAGES OF HOLY SCRIPTURE WHICH ARE ALLEGED FOR A
MATERIAL SACRIFICE IN THE EUCHARIST.

WE have ascertained the true notion of material sacrifice, as it is to be derived from Scripture. We have ascertained that a material sacrifice is one or more of certain living or inanimate things commanded by Almighty God, and offered to Him by the destruction of the life of the victim by bloodshedding, or of its being or substance by fire. And we have found that every description or definition of material sacrifice, which does not include this essential distinction between oblation and sacrifice, of the destruction of life or substance, must be rejected.

We have now, therefore, to examine whether there is any proof from Holy Scripture of a material sacrifice in the Lord's Supper.

But very important distinctions must first be clearly laid down and understood: the distinctions between the service or rite of the Eucharist, and the elements used in it; and the distinction in the sense of the word, sacrifice, as employed in either case. The service itself is called the Eucharistic sacrifice; and the elements of bread and wine, either by themselves or in combination with that which they signify, are also regarded as the Eucharistic sacrifice.

There are, as has been stated, only five ¹³² places of Scripture, which are alleged for a direct proof of a material sacrifice under the Gospel. The first is that passage of Malachi: "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts." * The times of the Gospel are said to be here spoken of; and to this, plainly, there can be no objection. But when

¹³² That is, understanding the four accounts of the institution as one; and the places also as one, which speak of our Lord as being a priest after the order of Melchisedek.

* Ch. i. v. 11.

the passage is applied to the Eucharist, a distinction must be recollected between the elements, which are so commonly called the Eucharist, and the service in which they are used. Mede applies it to both. He says:—

“*Incense* (as the Scripture itself, Rev. viii. 3, tells) notes the *Prayers of the Saints*. It was also that wherewith the remembrance, Isa. lxvi. 3, was made in the sacrifices, or God put in mind. *Mincha*, which we term *Munus*, a *Gift* or *offering*, is *oblatio farrea*, an offering made of meal or flower, baked or fried, or dried or parched corn. We, in our English, when we make distinction, call it a *meat-offering*; but might call it a *Bread-offering*, of which the *Libamen* or the *Drink-offering* being an indivisible concomitant, both are implied under the name *Mincha*, where it alone is named. The application then is easy: *Incense* here notes the *rational part* of our *Christian Sacrifice*, which is *Prayer*, *Thanksgiving*, and *Commemoration*; *Mincha* the *material part* thereof, which is *Oblatio farrea*, a Present of *Bread* and *Wine*.”*

Now the words of the prophet name two material substances—incense, and *Mincha*, or *meat-offering*; and Mede, with all that follow him in this application of the passage, takes incense spiritually, mystically, or figuratively; but takes offering literally, and this again with a mystical qualification: for he says, in another place, that the purity of the offering depends on “the disposition and affection of the offerer.”† This is, in substance, the interpretation of the theologians of Rome, and of all who advocate the theory of a material sacrifice. But it is clear that no critic or expositor of Holy Scripture would propose or accept such an interpretation, if he had not some special end to serve. He would not take one part of the sentence figuratively, and the other part literally, but would give to the whole one consistent interpretation; and would take both “incense” and “offering” respectively, either for literal incense and literal offering, or for figurative incense and figurative offering. And taking incense for figurative incense, and offering for figurative offering, that is, for spiritual incense and spiritual offering; there is no difficulty; the place receives a meaning worthy of its indisputable intention, and the true principles of interpretation are observed.

This interpretation seems to be fully authorised and enforced by those words of the Psalmist: “Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice.”‡

But more particularly is it authenticated by the words in the

* Christian Sacrifice, iii. Works, 1664, 454, 455.

† Ibid.

‡ Ps. cxli. 2.

third chapter: "He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." Now these sons of Levi, were to be not literally sons or descendants of Levi, but figuratively or spiritually, as Bellarmine confesses.¹³³

Now I believe that there is no question or doubt with any who take this passage of Malachi unmutilated, that "incense" is to be taken figuratively and spiritually. And it is only a foregone conclusion, that the bread and wine in the Eucharist are a sacrifice, which leads any to the inconsistency of taking "offering" literally, and thus to argue in a circle. The Church of Rome, indeed, mutilates the place; giving it in the Vulgate which she imposes as her authentical standard of Holy Scripture, in this way: "in omni loco sacrificetur, et offertur nomini meo oblatio munda:" the Douay version being; "in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation." It is thus cited in the Catechism of the Council of Trent,* and the controversialists of Rome produce it, of course, in the same form; although Bellarmine acknowledges that the Hebrew and Greek read: "incense is offered, and a pure sacrifice," and that some of the Fathers interpret incense of prayer.¹³⁴

These versions of the Church of Rome clearly evade the difficulty of an inconsistent interpretation, and are in reality a testimony to the true interpretation, and to the necessity of making not only "incense," but "offering" spiritual.

But it is not "offering" simply that is spoken of. It is "a pure offering." The "incense" to be offered would, indeed, be "pure," if offered under the old law; and it would certainly be pure, in the dispensation to which the prophecy refers: but the "offering" under that dispensation was to be especially "pure." Now I cannot find that any offerings or sacrifices of the law, presented under its most rigid conditions, were ever called "pure." The animate things prescribed by it were to be of those which were called "clean" or "pure": but the offerings of them I do not find to have been ever called "pure." And the flour or cakes which constituted the Mincha or meat-offering, while it was to be of "fine flour," † was never called "a

¹³³ "Per filios Levi, non possunt intelligi Levitæ veteris Testamenti."

* Pars. II. c. iv. De Euch. Sacram. sect. 81.

¹³⁴ "In Hebræa et Græca editione sic legimus: *Incensum offertur nomini meo, et sacrificium mundum.* Ubi vocem illam *incensum* Tertullianus interpretatur orationem, quod etiam ante eum fecit Irenæus—et post eum Hieron.—Sed posteriorem vocem sacrificium, communiter exponunt de Eucharistia."—De Missa Sacrif. c. x. vol. i. 751.

† Lev. ii. 1, 4, 7.

pure offering." But the same material things under either dispensation would be alike "pure" in themselves. No purer Mincha of flour could be offered under the Gospel, than that which was required under the law, or than that which had been offered by many under the law. The material offering, therefore, of the Mincha according to the law, would not be less pure in itself, than any other such offering would be in itself under the dispensation foretold in the prophecy.

For what reason, then, is the "offering" which was to be made "from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same," to be distinguished by its purity? Some offerings, it is true, of flour or bread were declared to be "holy" or "most holy unto the Lord," and some other offerings also: * but none were called "pure": and this universal offering to the greatness of God's name, of which the prophecy speaks, was to be distinguished by especial purity from all the offerings and sacrifices of the Jews.

Let it be granted, then, that this offering was to be material, a literal and actual Mincha: but still the purity by which it was to be distinguished from all the offerings of the law, even from the most holy, could not belong to any material offering: it could not be from any quality in the material offering, and must be from something external to it: and, therefore, the "pure offering" of the prophecy could not be any material offering. A material offering might be the sign and expression of an immaterial offering, but could not be the "pure offering" intended. That offering could only be from the "clean heart" and "right spirit," for which the Psalmist prayed, and which God has promised under the dispensation to which the prophecy refers: that "spirit," with which "the High and Lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy," has promised to "dwell;" whose sins and iniquities are no more remembered by Him, and whose oblations, notwithstanding the imperfections of all human thoughts and works, He has promised to accept. †

The purity of the offering is, indeed, said by some to be on account of the real presence of Christ in the bread and wine: but this question of the real presence has been disposed of in another place.

Again, we may observe, as has been noticed already, that the word for "offering" in this passage is "Mincha:" and

* Lev. ii. 3; xxi. 22; vi. 25.

† Ps. li. 10; Ez. xi. 19; Isa. lvii. 15; Jer. xxxi. 34; Ez. xx. 40, 41.

that the Mincha was not bread and wine, but was "fine flour," or "cakes," or "wafers," all with oil, to which frankincense sometimes, and salt always were added.* This was the Mincha or meat-offering, and when it was offered, it might be offered alone. But a drink-offering of wine was never offered with the meat-offering alone: it was only with the burnt-offerings, that drink-offerings were made in addition to the meat-offerings.† It is, therefore, not true as is so often alleged, that bread and wine were the Mincha of the law. Bread was part of it, but wine was not.

Whether these elements alone were capable or "incapable of being a true sacrifice" is not the question. They might be an oblation, as "the fruits of the earth, cakes or honeycombs, gold and silver, wool and milk, and, in a word, all the valuable and useful products of nature," ‡ might be: but there is no record that bread and wine alone were ever appointed for a sacrifice. If God had appointed them to be a sacrifice they would certainly have been as true a sacrifice, as bullocks, or rams, or goats: but He has nowhere appointed them to be a sacrifice, and their capability of being a sacrifice is clearly beside the question.

That the prophecy is fulfilled most fully and especially in the Eucharist, cannot be doubted: but what is the "pure offering" which is made in this sacrament? That it is not the elements of bread and wine, follows inevitably from the fact, that, as has been shown, they are, in themselves, of no greater purity than the Mincha of the law: that there is nothing to distinguish them as alone "a pure offering," in comparison with all the offerings which the law prescribed. And if they are not in themselves, neither can they be by themselves, the "pure offering" intended. If they were offered by wicked people who did not render "honour" or "fear" to God, but "despised His name," and regarded His "table" as "contemptible";¹³⁵ instead of being "pure," they would be "polluted," and would be as hateful to God, as the "burnt-offerings," the "meat-offerings," and the "peace-offerings of fat beasts," presented by the disobedient Jews. §

Nor, again, is it only in the Eucharist, that a fulfilment of

* Lev. ii. 1, 4-7; Ex. xxix. 40, 41; Lev. v. 11; Num. v. 15; Lev. ii. 15, 13.

† Num. xxviii. 12-15, 31; xxix. 30, 31, 39.

‡ Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, part 2, c. 1, sect. 4, vol. ii. 81.

¹³⁵ Malachi i. 7. The "polluted bread" which the Jews were charged with offering, is explained in v. 12 to be polluted, because they said, "The table of the Lord is polluted; and the fruit thereof, even his meat, is contemptible."

§ Amos v. 22.

the prophecy is to be discovered. For many "pure offerings" are made by Christians; in their prayers, in their praises and thanksgivings, and in their charitable acts; at other times than in the celebration of the Eucharist.

But they who "from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same," magnify the name of the Lord, do, by his creatures of bread broken, and of wine poured out, show forth the death and sacrifice of Christ; and rendering thanks to Almighty God for that inestimable benefit, feasting upon that sacrifice once for all made, and presenting themselves, their souls and bodies to Him, they offer a "reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice": and thus "incense" is "offered unto his name, and a pure offering."

It is not, however, to be denied, that many of the ancient Fathers seem to have thought that the elements themselves of the Eucharist were the "pure offering" intended by the prophecy. But they were neither unanimous nor unequivocal in the expression of this opinion. We cannot here enter at any length into an examination of their sentiments on this point: but that they were not unanimous is proved by the well-known expositions of Tertullian, Eusebius, and Jerome.

Tertullian having observed that God had commanded sacrifices to be offered by the Jews in the holy land only, puts the question, why the Spirit by Malachi speaks so differently? and David says: "Give unto the Lord, O ye kindreds of the people, give unto the Lord glory and strength. Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name: bring an offering and come into his courts"? and he replies to the question thus:—

"Undoubtedly, because the preaching of the Apostles was to go forth in all the earth. For that worship was to be offered to God not with earthly, but with spiritual sacrifices: as it is written: 'The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit;' and in another place: 'Offer unto God the sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vows unto the Most High' (Ps. li. 17, and l. 14). So therefore [the offerings] of praise are designated spiritual sacrifices, and a broken heart is demonstrated to be an acceptable sacrifice to God. Therefore how carnal sacrifices are understood to be reprobated, of which Isaiah speaks (i. 11, 12).—But of spiritual sacrifices He adds, saying: 'In every place pure sacrifices are offered unto my name.' Therefore since it is manifest, that both a temporal sabbath is shewn, and an eternal sabbath is predicted: that carnal circumcision is predicted, and spiritual circumcision is præindicated: that a temporal law also and an eternal law is proclaimed, that carnal sacrifices and spiritual sacrifices are foreshown: it follows, that after all these precepts given in the time past carnally to the

people of Israel, the time should come, in which the precepts of the ancient law, and of the old ceremonies should cease; and the promise of the New Law, the acknowledgment of spiritual sacrifices, and the promises of the New Testament, should supervene." ¹³⁶

There are two other places in which Tertullian cites this passage of Malachi, and explains the "incense and pure offering" to be the "rendering of glory, and benediction, and praise, and hymns:" and again, "sincere prayer from a pure conscience." ¹³⁷

Eusebius says: "that incense and sacrifice are offered to God in every place, what else does it signify, than that neither in Jerusalem, nor separately in this or that place, but in every place and in all nations, people should offer to Him who is God over all the incense by prayers, and the sacrifice which is called pure not by blood, but by pious deeds." ¹³⁸

Jerome says: "The word of the Lord now properly comes to the priests of the Jews, who offer the blind, the lame, and the sick for sacrifice: that they may know that spiritual victims are to take the place of carnal victims. And that by no means is the blood of bulls and of he-goats to be offered to the Lord, but Thymiamata, that is, the prayers of the saints: and that,

¹³⁶ "Indubitate, quod in omni terra exire habebat prædicatio Apostolorum. Adferte Deo claritatem et honorem, adferte Deo sacrificia nominis ejus. Tollite hostias, et introite in atria ejus. Namque quod non terrenis sacrificiis sed spiritalibus Deo litandum sit, ita legimus ut scriptum est: *Cor contribulatum hostia est Dei*; et alibi: *Sacrificia Deo sacrificium laudis, et redde Altissimo vota tua*. Sic, itaque sacrificia spiritalia laudis designantur et cor contribulatum acceptabile sacrificium Deo demonstratur: itaque quomodo carnalia sacrificia reprobata intelliguntur, de quibus et Esaias loquitur, dicens: *Quo mihi multitudinem sacrificiorum vestrorum, dicit Dominus? Ita sacrificia spiritalia accepta prædicantur, ut prophetae annuntiant. Quoniam etsi attuleritis, inquit, mihi similes, vanum est: incensum abominatio mihi*. Et alibi dicit: *Holocaustomata et sacrificia vestra et adipem hircorum, et sanguinem taurorum nolo, nec si veniatis videri mihi, quis enim exquisivit hæc de manibus vestris? Spiritalia vero sacrificia de quibus prædictum est, et sicut supra dicit: Non est mihi voluntas a vobis, dicit Dominus. Sacrificium non accipiam de manibus vestris: quoniam ab oriente sole usque in occidentem nomen meum clarificatum est in omnibus gentibus, dicit Dominus*. De spiritalibus vero sacrificiis, addit dicens: *Et in omni loco sacrificia munda offerentur nomini meo dicit Dominus*. Igitur eum manifestum sit, et sabbatum temporale ostensum, et sabbatum æternum prædictum: circumcisionem carnalem prædictam, et circumcisionem spiritalem præindicatam: legem quoque temporalem et legem æternam denunciata: sacrificia carnalia, et sacrificia spiritalia præostensa: sequitur, ut præcedente tempore datis omnibus istis præceptis carnaliter populo Israel, supervenerit tempus, quo legis antiquæ et ceremoniarum veterum præcepta cessarent, et novæ legis promissio, spiritalium sacrificiorum agnitio, et Novi Testamenti pollicitatio superveniret."—Adv. Jud. ec. 5, 6, Opp. Colon. Agrip. 1617, p. 98.

¹³⁷ "Gloriæ, scilicet, relatio, et benedictio, et laus, et hymni."—Adv. Mar. lib. iiii. c. 22, p. 488. "Scilicet, simplex oratio de conscientia pura."—Ibid. iiii. c. 1, p. 51.

¹³⁸ τὸ γὰρ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ θυμίαμα καὶ θυσίαν ἀναφέρεισθαι Θεῷ, τί ἕτερον παρίστησιν, ἢ ὅτι μὴ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὺμοις, μηδ' ἀφωρισμένως ἐν τῷ δὲ τῷ τόπῳ, ἐν πάσῃ δὲ χώρᾳ, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι μένοισι τὸ δι' εὐχῶν θυμίαμα, καὶ τὴν οὐ δι' αἱμάτων, ἀλλὰ δι' ἔργων εἰσεβῶν καθαρὰν ὄνομασμένην θυσίαν τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀναφέρειν Θεῷ.—Demonstr. I. vi.

not in the one province of the world, Judæa only, nor in the one city of the Jews, Jerusalem, but in every place, is offered an oblation in no wise impure as [was offered] by the people of Israel, but pure, as in the ceremonies of Christians. Nor do ye understand that Almighty God desires not gold, and gems, and a multitude of victims, but the wills of the offerers.”¹³⁹

Thus these three ancient writers, and they of no mean authority, the latest of them also belonging to the end of the fourth century, interpret the passage of Malachi before us, not of literal and material, but of spiritual sacrifices: not of bread and wine, but of the “rendering of glory, benediction, praise, and hymns”; of “sincere prayer from a pure conscience,” “the prayers of the saints,”—and “the wills of the offerers.” Proofs might be given, if it were necessary, of a real agreement with these writers on the part of not a few others who are thought to favour the notion of a material oblation or sacrifice being intended in the place. But the testimonies of Tertullian, Eusebius, and Jerome above cited, are sufficient to show, that the application of the words “a pure offering” to the elements in the Eucharist, has not the warrant of Catholicity: if, at least, the rule of Vincentius for the test of Catholicity, “quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus,” be admitted.

II. The second place of Scripture which is brought for proof of the material sacrifice, is in our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount. He said: “If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.”* And in reference to this place, it is represented that reconciliation with an offended brother before sacrificing was not commanded by the law of Moses, nor to be found “among the traditions of the elders”; and that “it is altogether improbable that our Saviour would then annex a new rite to the legal sacrifices, when He was so soon after to abolish them by his sacrifice

¹³⁹ “Proprie nunc ad sacerdotes Judæorum sermo fit Domini, qui offerunt cæcum et claudum et languidum ad immolandum: ut sciant carnalibus victimis spirituales victimas successuras. Et nequaquam taurorum hircorumque sanguinem, sed Thymiama, hoc est, sanctorum orationes Domino offerendas. Et non in una orbis provincia Judea, nec in una Judæorum urbe Hierusalem, sed in omni loco offerri oblationem nequaquam immundam ut a populo Israel, sed mundam, ut in cerimoniis Christianorum. Nec intelligitis omnipotentem Deum non aurum, gemmasque, et hostiarum multitudinem quærere, sed offerentium voluntates.”—In loc.

* Matt. vi. 23, 24.

upon the cross": and that "therefore He intended it for an ordinance of the kingdom of God (as the Scripture calls it), that is, for the Church of his Gospel." * This precept, then, thus belonging exclusively to the Gospel, we learn from it that Christians have an altar; and that this must be a literal altar follows from the fact that literal and material gifts are to be brought to it to be there "presented to Almighty God, and thereby dedicated to his service." And these gifts, "unquestionably" are "the oblations made by Christians at the Holy Table," comprehending, with other things, the bread and wine for the Holy Supper. And the conclusion intended to be drawn, though not formally expressed, is, that the elements in the Eucharist are a proper material sacrifice.

Now, in the first place, we must demur to the assertion that the precept before us belongs exclusively to the Gospel, and that it was not intended by our Lord to be observed until He had established the Christian altar, and abolished the sacrifices of the law. It is hardly possible for any person, unbiassed by theory, to read the Sermon on the Mount, and to imagine that our Lord meant the observance of any one precept in it to be thus suspended. For when we read the awful warning against anger which precedes the words before us, and from which they are a deduction; this warning again being preceded by the assurance: "I say unto you, except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of God": and when also we read the words immediately following: "agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him":—we can have no doubt of the urgency as well as importance which our Lord attached to the precept in question. There is absolutely nothing in it, or in its context, to give the slightest warrant for the supposition that it pertained only to the new dispensation, and that its observance was to be deferred until that dispensation should have been established. It is evident that our Lord intended his disciples to act upon it from that day forward, even in the offerings which they might as yet bring before the altar of the temple in Jerusalem. This altar, therefore, was primarily and more immediately intended.

But the precept was not confined to it. Its spirit and intention reached far beyond, even to the utmost parts of the earth, and to the end of time. It applied to both dispensations: to the Jewish, as long as it should continue; to the Christian, for

* Mede, Disc. 46, vol. iv. p. 359.

ever. And the Christian altar was, undoubtedly, the altar, which, though secondarily and indirectly, yet chiefly, was intended in the precept.

What, then, is the Christian altar? Now, it must be laid down that, as is the dispensation, so is the altar: and by so much as the Gospel is "a better testament," than the law, the altar of the Gospel is also better than the altar of the law. In the temple it was a literal altar, and on it were literal and carnal oblations offered, literal and carnal sacrifices made. This altar was served, and these oblations and sacrifices were made, by a Levitical priesthood. But the Gospel has, not a Levitical, but a spiritual, priesthood who offer up spiritual sacrifices: and as the altar must be of the same character with the priesthood which ministers at it, and with the sacrifices which that priesthood offers; the altar intended by our Lord is, therefore, not a literal altar, on which literal sacrifices are offered and consumed by fire; but a spiritual altar for the ministrations of a spiritual priesthood, and the offering up of spiritual sacrifices. This altar, therefore, cannot prove material sacrifices; neither can the sacrifices which are offered upon it, prove a material altar.

It may, perhaps, be objected, that although the Gospel has a spiritual priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, it does not follow that this priesthood is not to offer material sacrifices also, and that there is not likewise a material altar for those sacrifices. But the question immediately before us is, not whether there are material sacrifices under the Gospel from which the existence of a material altar would be proved; but whether there is a material altar from which material sacrifices may be proved.

The confounding of these two propositions is, indeed, the vice of the argument under consideration: for, if it means anything, it must mean this, that some "gifts" to be brought by Christians, are material sacrifices; that material sacrifices require a material altar; and that a material altar demonstrates material sacrifices. But this is merely reasoning in a circle, or proving a thing only by itself. It proves the altar by the sacrifice, and then the sacrifice by the altar. No proof, therefore, of a material altar and material sacrifice under the Gospel, is to be legitimately deduced from this place. It cannot prove anything in favour of the doctrine that the elements in the Eucharist are a real or "a strict and proper sacrifice."

III. The third place brought to prove that the bread and wine in the Eucharist are a sacrifice offered to God, is the account of the institution of this Sacrament. Mede, seemingly ignoring his own distinction between oblation and sacrifice, and defining sacrifice to be “nothing else but a sacred feast, namely *Epulum fœderale*, wherein God mystically entertained man at His own table, in token of amity and friendship with him: which that He might do, the viands of that feast were first made God’s by oblation, and so eaten of, not as of man’s, but God’s provision,”* says that “our blessed Saviour Himself—when at the institution of this holy rite, He took the bread and the cup into His sacred hands, and looking up to heaven gave thanks and blessed,” “did” by this act make an oblation, and “full out a sacrifice” to God, of “the viands,—that so being His, He might be the *Convivator*, and man the *conviva*, or the Guest.” But whether or not this can prove the oblation of the elements,—a question which must be reserved for another place,—it certainly does not prove a sacrifice of the elements. According, indeed, to the definition here given of sacrifice, it must be admitted, that if our Lord did make an oblation of the bread and wine, He did also sacrifice them, and that thus they were a material sacrifice: but the definition is manifestly insufficient. It ignores the way in which alone the materials of the fœderal feast were devoted to God, and denies the character of sacrifice to those oblations of which man did not partake: it denies the character of sacrifice to some of the very chief sacrifices of the law, which were not partaken of by the offerers.

Mede, however, in another place of the same treatise, infers the oblation of the elements in the Eucharist, from an assumed oblation of them in the Passover. He says: “The Passover was a sacrifice, and therefore the viands here, as well as in all other holy feasts, were first offered unto God. Now the bread and wine, which our Saviour took when He blessed and gave thanks, was the *Mincha* or meat offering of the Passover.”† But this very learned writer is singularly incorrect in these assertions. Most truly, the Passover, or the Paschal lamb, was a sacrifice; but there is not the slightest shadow of proof, that either the unleavened bread which was eaten with it, or the viands after it was eaten, were first offered unto God. There is no sacrifice or oblation of the bread prescribed in the institution of the Passover. Only after the directions for the killing of

* Christian Sacrifice, c. viii. I. 373.

† Ibid. 477.

the lamb, and the sprinkling of its blood, it was commanded : " they shall eat the flesh in the night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread ; and with bitter herbs they shall eat it."* The bread was merely an adjunct to the lamb after it had been sacrificed and roasted ; a part, not of the sacrifice, but of the feast upon the sacrifice. So likewise, the bread and wine which were used at the institution of the Eucharist, were not a part of the sacrifice of the Passover, but a part of the feast upon it.

Neither, again, were bread and wine a *Mincha*, or meat-offering. Wine was a drink-offering added to some of the meat-offerings, as in the morning and evening sacrifices ; † but not to all meat offerings. ‡ But bread was not in any way or form a meat-offering by itself. It was to be always " seasoned with salt," § and except when offered as a sin offering, || it was to have oil poured upon it. The *Mincha*, properly speaking, was of flour, or cakes with oil and salt, and sometimes with frankincense. ¶ Bread and wine, therefore, were not the *Mincha*. Nor was any *Mincha* offered with the Paschal lamb : and in fact, though the lamb was a sacrifice ; yet there was no oblation upon the altar, either of the lamb itself, or of anything whatsoever that was to be eaten with it.

Johnson also makes a very laborious attempt to prove the Eucharistic sacrifice in his sense, that is, a sacrifice of the elements, from the accounts of the institution. His argument, indeed, is so hazy and confused that it is extremely difficult to make out what his premisses and conclusion are : but it seems to me to be, briefly, this : that our blessed Saviour " did actually offer Himself to God under the representatives of bread broken and wine poured out : " ** that He made the bread his body and the wine his blood, and so sacrificed them : and thus in spirit, intention, and in truth and effect, sacrificed Himself. Or that, as He sacrificed Himself in spirit, He sacrificed the bread, which He made his sacramental body, in fact ; or that, by the sacrifice of his sacramental body, He in truth and reality sacrificed his natural body under it. And this amounts only to saying, that our Lord sacrificed the bread, therefore He sacrificed Himself : He sacrificed Himself, therefore He sacrificed the bread.

I may be mistaken, but I cannot make out the real pith and

* Exod. xii. 8.

† Exod. xxix. 40, 41 ; Num. xv. 3-11, 24 ; Lev. xxiii. 13-18 ; Num. xxviii. 10.

‡ Lev. ii. 1, 2, 4. &c.

§ Ibid. 13.

|| V. 11.

¶ II. 2.

** Unbloody Sacrifice, c. 2, sect. 1, I. 161.

substance of the argument to be anything more than as I have thus epitomised it. And if I have correctly represented it, it is only a proof of a thing by itself, a proof of the sacrifice of the elements by merely assuming it.

That our Lord, in the institution of this holy Sacrament, offered Himself to God, may be in some sense true: because He was ready to be offered, and his hour was come, and He was come to that hour, for the express purpose of offering Himself.* But it would be true also of his whole life upon earth, for He “came to give his life a ransom for many.”† And especially from the time when He began to tell his disciples of his approaching death, until He said “It is finished,” it was one continued oblation of Himself to his Father, in full voluntary purpose and in spirit. But though the oblation of Himself may, or perhaps must, have been made in his prayer after Supper, and just before He entered into the garden, and more particularly by those words: “for their sakes I sanctify myself:”‡ yet the actual sacrifice was made only when He laid down his life upon the Cross, saying: “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,” thus of his own power yielding up his life.§

It is therefore not true that our Lord “did actually offer Himself to God” in the institution of the Eucharist; and it is therefore not true that He “did actually offer Himself to God under the representatives of bread broken and wine poured out.” It is not true that either under them, or in them, or by them, or with them, He offered up Himself a sacrifice for our sins. It was “by the blood of His cross” only, that He “made peace” and “reconciled all things unto God.”|| It was then that He was “perfected.”¶

Johnson, indeed, very justly observes, “that when our Saviour says, ‘This is my body given,’ by ‘given’ He means offered, or sacrificed to God.” But I apprehend that no arguments, and no authorities, however learned or ancient, can prove “for certain and indisputable, that the body here spoken of was now actually given, yielded, offered to God by our Saviour, as a Priest according to the order of Melchisedec.”** We have to treat of the priesthood “after the order of Melchisedec” in another place: the question here is, whether, as is asserted, the body of which our Lord spoke, was at that

* John xii. 27. † Matt. xx. 28. ‡ Jno. xiii. 2; xviii. 1; xvii. 19.

§ Luke xxiii. 46; John x. 18. || Col. i. 20. ¶ Heb. vii. 28, Gr.

** Unbloody Sacrifice, part I. c. ii. sect. 1, I. 160, 161.

moment, "actually given," or sacrificed, to God. Now it is undeniable that when He said, "This is my body which is given for you, This is my blood which is shed for you"; He meant his own personal body; and that He made the bread and the wine to be, in a most true and effectual sense, that which He declared them to be. He made these elements, as He declared them, to be his body given, sacrificed to God, and his blood shed. And inasmuch as He gave them separately, his body and his blood separately from each other, He showed a sacrifice completed by an actual death: for "the blood is the life"; and the blood poured out from the body, signified the body as dead.¹⁴⁰ And this was before He Himself died, and while He was as really and as much alive as any of the persons to whom He spoke. He, being alive, and as yet unhurt by any deadly wound, gave his dead body to them. And this He could do as well before He died, as He has ever done, since He rose again from the dead. But as He was then alive, and his body unbroken, the sacrifice of Himself was not then at that moment actually made. The body of which He spoke was not then

¹⁴⁰ "Sanguis enim separatim consecratus. ad passionem Domini, et mortem, et passionis genus ante omnium oculos ponendum, majorem vim et momentum habet."—"Optimo tamen jure institutum est ut separatim duze consecrationes fierent. Primo enim passio Domini, in qua sanguis a corpore divisus est, magis referatur."—Cat. Conc. Trid. II. xxiii. xxxiv.

"The blood separately consecrated has greater force and power to place before the eyes of all, the passion of the Lord, and His death, and the nature of His sufferings."—"It was with the best reason appointed that two consecrations should be separately performed; first, that the Lord's passion, in which the blood was divided from the body, should be more exhibited."

Bellarmino says also: "In the Supper the body is consecrated apart, and the blood apart, for this purpose, that we might understand that the presence of the body and blood in the Supper, is after the manner of a slain and dead body. Ideo in cœna seorsim consecratur corpus, et seorsim sanguis, ut intelligamus præsentiam corporis et sanguinis in cœna esse ad modum occisi et mortui corporis."—*De Missa*, I. xli. 757.

"To signify his complete or perfect death, by the separation of his blood from his body—the blood being the life thereof—He took the cup, and consecrated or separated it, to signify or represent his blood, so shed or poured out . . . calling them [the bread and wine] and in effect making them, his body and blood, broken and shed; while his natural substantial body, with his blood in his veins, unbroken and unshed, stood divinely ministering, and as yet untouched by any hostile hand."—*Bishop Jolly's Christian Sacrifice*, c. 3, Aberdeen, 1831, pp. 63, 58.

"The bread and wine being given to us severally, not both together, do clearly tell us that He was really dead, his vital blood being separated from his body, and his veins and heart being emptied of it."—*Patrick's Mensa Mystica*, I. ii. Ed. 7, Lond. 1717, 11.

"Whatsoever our Saviour said, was undoubtedly true: but these words could not be true in a proper sense, for our Saviour's body was not then given or broken, but whole and inviolate, nor was there one drop of his blood shed."—*Bull, Corruptions of the Church of Rome*. Works, II. 254.

Aquinas says: "Eucharistia est sacramentum perfectum Dominicæ passionis, tanquam continens ipsum Christum passum. The Eucharist is a perfect sacrament of the Lord's passion, as containing Christ Himself in His passion."—*3a*, q. 73, con.

actually offered up to God. It was devoted, certainly : but it was not then as yet actually sacrificed.

How, then, shall the sacrifice of the bread and wine, either as the elements for the sacrament, or as "the mysterious body and blood" of Christ, be shown from this? We do not read of any oblation, much less sacrifice, of the elements, before the consecration. They were neither oblation nor sacrifice in the Paschal rites; but were part of the feast in which the Passover was eaten. Nor do we read of any sacrifice of the elements in the consecration. Johnson, indeed, asserts that "we have the express words of Christ Jesus Himself—fully attesting this great truth; namely, that He did, in the institution of this sacrament, actually offer bread and wine to God:"* but there is not a syllable in the accounts given by the Evangelists or St. Paul, of our Lord's then offering or having offered bread and wine, either as oblation or as sacrifice to God. He spoke of his body given, and his blood shed, but said nothing of any oblation or sacrifice of the things which He called by those names. Nor would the consumption of the bread and wine by the communicants be the sacrifice of them: for our Lord said before they did eat and drink, "This is my body given, This is my blood shed, for you": and so, the bread was the body of Christ given, and the wine was his blood shed, and the sacrifice was therefore complete, before they consumed them. Thus, neither before the consecration, nor in the consecration, were they sacrificed, nor yet after the consecration. Still they were the given body, and the poured-out blood. They were received as his body and blood before He had actually suffered: and while the world lasts, they are to be received as such; although He "dieth no more," and "death hath no more dominion over Him."† Since the sacrifice upon the cross, He has ever been, and always will be, incapable of suffering: and yet He gives to us his broken body, and his poured-out blood. He that is "alive for evermore," gives us even his flesh to eat and his blood to drink. And how this is, will also explain how He could give his dead body before He died, and his blood poured out before it was shed: how He made the disciples partakers of his sacrifice before it was offered.

Our Lord at the institution of the Eucharist, did actually offer or sacrifice neither Himself, nor the bread and wine either as the elements for the sacrament, or as "his mysterious body

* P. 160.

† Rom. vi. 9.

and blood." He called, and in a most true and effectual sense so made, the bread his body, and the wine his blood: for as "He spake;" so it could not but be "done:" and He "calleft those things which be not," yet "as being."* But this was not to sacrifice the bread and wine, or to offer them as a sacrifice. And again, He gave his broken body and his poured-out blood, giving the dead body: but there is not a word to warrant the assertion that his body "was now actually given, yielded, offered to God:" that He was, at that very instant of time, actually offering, or that He had actually offered Himself. The actual offering, the actual immolation of Himself was not yet done; and so really not done, that He prayed in the garden, that "if it" were "possible this cup" might "pass from" Him. But there is no more contradiction or inconsistency in these things than there is in the assured truth, that the Son of God is "the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world." † The distinction is, indeed, very important, as will elsewhere be seen, between these two statements; (1) that Our Lord, in the institution of the Eucharist, actually offered Himself to God, and gave his body and blood so offered, to the Apostles: and (2) simply, that He gave his broken body, and his poured-out blood to them. The former is an addition to the inspired record; and one of astounding consequence; for it is said that what our Lord then did his priests are also to do, and thus they are to offer Him. The latter statement is neither more nor less than the exact truth which He expressed.

With regard to this doctrine of our Lord having offered up Himself in the Eucharist, Bishop Jeremy Taylor makes these just and forcible remarks: "The blessed Sacrament," he says, "is the same thing now as it was in the institution of it; but Christ did not really give His natural body in the natural sense, when He ate His last supper; therefore neither does He now."— If "He then gave His natural body, then it was naturally broken, and His blood was actually poured forth before His passion; for He gave τὸ σῶμα κλώμενον, τὸ ποτήριον, or αἷμα ἐκχυνόμενον, His body was delivered broken, His blood was shed. Now these words were spoken either properly and naturally; and then they were not true, because his body was yet whole, his blood still in the proper channels, or else it was spoken in a figurative and sacramental sense, and so it was true: (as were all the

* Ps. cxlviii. 5, Prayer Book version; Rom. iv. τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα.

† Rev. xiii. 8.

words which our blessed Saviour spake;) for that which He then ministered was the sacrament of His passion." And "If Christ gave His body in the natural sense, at the last supper, then it was either a sacrifice propitiatory, or it was not: if it was not, then it is not now:"—"if it was propitiatory at the last supper, then God was reconciled to all the world, and mankind was redeemed before the passion of our blessed Saviour, which therefore would have been needless and ineffective; so fearful are the consequences of this strange doctrine." ¹⁴¹

Another proof of the sacrifice of the elements is attempted from the word, *ποιεῖτε*, in St. Luke's and St. Paul's accounts of the institution. Hickes and Johnson, and recently the late Bishop Hamilton, maintain that this word means "sacrifice"; and therefore that our Lord's words, "Do this in remembrance of me," must be taken to mean, "Sacrifice this bread and this wine in remembrance of me." Bellarmine ¹⁴² had previously given the 'same interpretation; but this was only incidentally, and he did not insist upon it for any proof of his argument.

Now *ποιέω*, like our English word "make," has a large number of very different significations, ¹⁴³ determined by its connection: and it is used in the Septuagint for fifty-two different Hebrew words, and amongst them, one of much the same versatility as itself. Of the various significations which it and this Hebrew word have, that of "sacrifice" is certainly one: but this is only in connection with words which clearly determine the meaning. Some thirty or forty places of the Septuagint are cited by Hickes for this meaning of "sacrifice:" but in every instance, the word, in whatever form, is joined with others, which show that it must have the meaning of "sacrifice" in that place, and could not have any other meaning. ¹⁴⁴ Whereas I do not find

¹⁴¹ On the Real Presence, vii. 1-3. Works, ix. 491. "According to this opinion [of His offering up Himself in the Eucharist] Christ offered up Himself before He offered up Himself; I mean, He offered up Himself in the sacrament before He offered up Himself on the cross; which offering up Himself in the sacrament was either a perfect or an imperfect sacrifice. To say that Christ should offer up an imperfect sacrifice to God is next door to blasphemy; but yet a perfect one that sacrifice could not be, for then it need not have been repeated again upon the cross."—Beveridge on the 39 Articles: Art. xxxi. Works, Oxford, Angl. Cath. Lib. vii. 506, 507.

¹⁴² De Missa, I. xii. 755, A. B. But the Trent Catechism is opposed to this: "That which the Lord commanded to be done, must be referred not only to that which He had done, but also to that which He had said. Quod Dominus faciendum præcipit, non solum ad id quod egerat, sed etiam ad ea quæ dixerat referri debet."—De Euch. xx. *nota*. His words could not be sacrificed.

¹⁴³ Schleusner gives forty-seven meanings for it.

¹⁴⁴ Ex. xxix. 36 it is found with *μοσχάριον*: Lev. iv. 20; 1 Kings xviii. 25, 26, with *μόσχον*: 1 Kings xviii. 25 with *βοῦν*: Ps. lxxvi. 15 with *βόας*: Lev. xxiii. 12 with *πρόβατον*: Ex. xxix. 39, 41 with *ἀμνόν*: Lev. xiv. 30 with *μία* ἀπὸ τῶν τρυγόνων:

ποιέω in any form joined with ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον. So that, there is no authority in the Septuagint for the assertion that τοῦτο ποιεῖτε in the words of the institution mean "offer" or "sacrifice, this bread and this wine." Neither is there any authority for supposing that ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν has a sacrificial signification. The argument, indeed, from the word ποιεῖτε is, in substance, no better than this: that ποιεῖν sometimes signifies to sacrifice; therefore it must have this meaning in the words of the institution: a conclusion which would not follow, unless it were to be understood, that it had this meaning always; which is manifestly false.*

From this examination of the accounts of the institution of the Eucharist, I must think it is clear, that they do not show any material sacrifice in that Sacrament: that our Lord did not actually sacrifice the bread and wine either as the elements for the Sacrament, or as "His mysterious body and blood:" that He did not then actually sacrifice Himself: and that He did not command the apostles either to sacrifice the elements, or to offer up Himself as a sacrifice.

IV. The fourth place which is alleged in proof of a material sacrifice in the Eucharist, is that place in the Epistle to the Hebrews in which our Lord Jesus Christ is said to have been "called of God an High Priest after the order of Melchisedek." † And the line of argument by which this place is to be applied for the required proof must be in effect as follows. Starting from the statement in Genesis, that "Melchisedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the Most High God. And he blessed Abraham"; ‡ it would have to be laid down, that a priest is a person who offers sacrifices: that Melchisedek, being a priest, offered sacrifices; that he offered sacrifice on the occasion referred to; that the sacrifice he offered was bread and wine; that a priest after his order must be one who also sacrifices bread and wine; and therefore that our Lord, being a Priest after the order of Melchisedek, must of necessity have offered a sacrifice of bread and wine; and that this sacrifice was offered by Him in the institution of the Eucharist. Various ways are taken

Ex. x. 25; Lev. ix. 16; xvii. 4, 9; 1 Kings xviii. 29; 2 Kings x. 24, with δλοκαύτωμα: 1 Kings viii. 61; 2 Kings x. 25 with δλοκαύτωσιν: Lev. vi. 22; 2 Kings x. 21, with θυσίαν: 2 Kings x. 24 with θύματα καὶ δλοκαυτώματα: Lev. ix. 7, 22; xiv. 19, with τὸ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας: Lev. ix. 7 with δῶρα and ἐξίλασαι: Deut. xvi. 1; 2 Chron. xxx. 1, 2; xxxv. 1; Ezra vi. 19; Num. ix. 2; Joshua v. 9; 2 Kings xxiii. 21; 2 Chron. xxxv. 17 with πάσχα or φασέκ: and Ex. xxix. 38 with θουσιαστήριον.

* See Appendix F F.

† Heb. v. 10.

‡ Gen. xiv. 18, 19.

for establishing the different propositions of which this argument is composed: but the assertions that he offered sacrifice on the occasion of meeting Abraham; that the sacrifice he offered was bread and wine; and that a priest after his order must be one who also sacrifices bread and wine; are propositions which require much better proofs than the most learned and ingenious advocates of material sacrifice have yet offered to the world. The propositions in question have not that clear and certain authority of God's word, which is necessary for the foundation of Christian doctrine. Holy Scripture does not tell us, that Melchisedek offered sacrifice on this occasion: or that bread and wine were the sacrifice. Nor is there any proof from Scripture, that a priest after his order must be one whose sacrifices are bread and wine also. Such statements are additions to that which is written in the Book. They are mere assumptions to meet the necessities of the preconceived theory, that the elements of the Eucharist are a true and proper sacrifice.

But it is not sufficient to meet one assertion with another. The evidence for the alleged sacrifice of bread and wine by Melchisedek, on his meeting Abraham, must be produced and examined. Now this evidence is supposed to be drawn from the three statements in Genesis, that Melchisedek was a priest; that he brought forth bread and wine; and that he blessed Abraham. That he was a priest, then, the sacred history states; and that a priest is a person who has authority to offer sacrifice must in all reason be acknowledged, as has been just now asserted: but it does not at all follow, that whenever it is related of anyone, that he is a priest, we must infer that he offered sacrifice upon such an occasion.¹⁴⁵ It may be probable that Melchisedek had been offering sacrifice: but nothing more can be proved: and probability may be so different from fact as to be absolutely contrary to it. Perhaps it may be asked, why it is said that Melchisedek "was priest of the Most High God,"

¹⁴⁵ This seems to be Bellarmine's opinion. He says that "Melchisedek offered bread and wine, as priest of the Most High God, and therefore truly sacrificed [them];" and from this he infers, that "Christ also, in the institution of the Eucharist, acted as priest, and truly sacrificed; otherwise He could not have exactly fulfilled that figure." "Melchisedek panem et vinum obtulit, ut sacerdos Dei altissimi, ac proinde vere sacrificavit; igitur et Christus in institutione Eucharistiæ, ut sacerdos egit, et vere sacrificavit, alioque non exacte figuram illam impleisset."—De Missa, I. vi. 722. This would make every oblation, or even act, by a priest a sacrifice, which is manifestly false. So that we have here a mere assumption that Melchisedek offered the bread and wine; and next the false inference that he sacrificed them; and then to bring the assumption and inference to bear on the Eucharist, the further assumption that Christ acted as a priest in the institution of the Eucharist by sacrificing the elements He employed in it.

if it were not to intimate and to be concluded, that he had been fulfilling the office of a priest by sacrifice. But it may be asked also, in return, why it is said of him that he was king of Salem. Equally probable or likely reasons might be suggested in each case: but they would be only probable; and, as I have said, they might be the reverse of fact.

Again, that Melchisedek "brought forth bread and wine" is also expressly stated. But some will have it that we ought to read "offered" instead of "brought forth." Some, indeed, quietly take it for certain that we may read "offered":¹⁴⁶ but Bellarmine tries to prove it. Speaking of the word "proferens," "bringing forth," in the Latin Vulgate of the place, he says that, "although the word of itself signifies nothing else than to bring forth, or to bring forward, yet from the exigency of its position [or of the passage] it is often used for the bringing forth of a victim for immolation, as in Judges vi. where the same [Hebrew] word which we perceive in this place in Genesis is twice used, and clearly signifies the bringing of a victim."¹⁴⁷ "The exigency of position," in which the word stands in the two places referred to, certainly does not fix upon it the meaning of bringing forth for immolation. The two places are Judges vi. 18, 19,¹⁴⁸ where we read that Gideon said to the angel: "Depart not hence, I pray thee, until I come unto thee, and bring forth my present, and set it before thee. And Gideon went in, and made ready a kid, and unleavened cakes of an ephah of flour: the flesh he put in a basket, and he put the broth in a pot, and brought it out unto him under the oak, and presented it." The "present," then, which Gideon wished to "bring forth," and which he "brought out," was the flesh, the boiled flesh of a kid, with cakes, and the broth made by the boiling of the flesh. This was what he brought forth and presented to the angel: and in whatever way the kid had been killed, the bringing forth of its boiled flesh was not a bringing forth of it for immolation or sacrifice to the angel.

The Cardinal adds a most extraordinary reason in confirmation

¹⁴⁶ "Moses tells us of Melchisedec, that this priest of the Most High God brought forth (or offered) bread and wine."—Theologian, ix. 41.

¹⁴⁷ "Quod tamen verbum licet ex se nihil aliud significet, nisi proferre, seu adducere, tamen pro loci exigentia sæpe usurpatur pro adductione hostiæ ad immolationem, ut Jud. 6, ubi bis habetur idem verbum מִנְחָה quod hoc loco in Genesi cernimus, et aperte significat adductionem hostiæ." And he adds: "Quod idem videmus in verbo מִנְחָה quod proprie adducere significat, et tamen passim in Scriptura restringitur ad sacrificium, ut idem sit quod offerre, ut patet Genes. 4, ubi describitur sacrificium Cain et Abel."—De Missa, I. vi. p. 723, 4.

¹⁴⁸ I conclude that the 8th and 30th verses cannot be intended.

of the meaning which he would fix upon the Hebrew word in question, namely, that another Hebrew word, "likewise properly signifies to bring, and yet is everywhere restricted in Scripture to sacrifice, so as to be the same as to offer."

I must add that I do not find "to offer," or "to offer in sacrifice," amongst the many significations of the word in Gen. xiv. 18, in the Lexicons.

The Hebrew particle, however, for which our authorised translation has "and," is made a causal conjunction by the Latin Vulgate and therefore by the Douay English: and they read the passage thus: "bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the Most High God." And Bellarmine defends this as critically correct: and he argues, therefore, that "it is most effectually proved" by the words, "'for he was the priest of the Most High God,' that by the bread and wine we are to understand not common food, but food sanctified and offered previously to God: which reason rendered by the Holy Spirit Himself why Melchisedek brought forth bread and wine, absolutely compels us to understand that the bread and wine were brought forth for sacrifice."¹⁴⁹

The argument is somewhat careless and inconsistent with itself: for it represents the bread and wine as offered to God before they were brought forth, and yet as brought forth to be offered on the arrival of Abraham. But that the particle sometimes has the meaning of "for" or "because," "before causal sentences," that is, before sentences which clearly denote a cause of that which is expressed before, there can be no doubt. It is one of a considerable variety of meanings which the particle has, according to the exigency of its position, although it is "properly and most frequently" used as a copulative.¹⁵⁰ But in order to determine that it is a "causal" and not a "copulative conjunction" in this particular place, it must be shown that the sentence to which it belongs is causal: it must be shown that the bringing forth of the bread and wine by Melchisedek, was because he was a priest. This, however, is not generally thought to have been the case. Not a few, and

¹⁴⁹ "Oportet igitur per panem et vinum, non prophanos cibos, sed sanctificatos, et Deo prius oblatos intelligere. Denique id probatur efficacissime ex verbis sequentibus; subjungit enim Scriptura: *Erat enim sacerdos Dei altissimi*. Quæ ratio ab ipso Spiritu Sancto reddita, cur Melchisedech panem et vinum protulerit, omnino cogit, ut intelligamus panem et vinum prolata fuisse ad sacrificium."—De Missa, l. vii. p. 724.

¹⁵⁰ Gesenius. Castell gives twenty-six meanings for the particle: all traceable from the original meaning "and," which in the infancy of language is capable of serving in many senses.

these of no mean authority, considering the order of the words: "Melchisedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the Most High God; and he blessed" Abraham, refer the two acts of bringing forth the bread and wine, and the blessing of Abraham to the two offices respectively. They conceive that it was as king that he brought forth the bread and wine, and as priest that he blessed Abraham. The Epistle to the Hebrews most clearly connects the blessing with the priesthood.* And St. Augustine cites St. Cyprian as saying: "Melchisedek brought forth bread and wine. But he was the priest of the Most High God, and blessed Abraham."¹⁵¹ And, indeed, it is acknowledged that he gave his blessing as a priest, whether he gave it as a king also or not. But that he gave it as a king does not appear. On the principle laid down in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "That the less is blessed of the greater," Melchisedek gave his blessing certainly as a priest; because, as Abraham acknowledged by the payment of tithes to him, Abraham's priesthood was "less" than his. But there is nothing to show that as a king, Melchisedek had any superiority over Abraham the conqueror of five kings. Nor do we read that the other king, the king of Sodom, who "went out to meet" Abraham, and who owed to him the restoration of his people and his goods, took upon him any authority, as the greater, to bless him. On the other hand, Josephus, speaking of these transactions, makes no mention of any sacrifice in the case, but merely says that "Melchisedek showed hospitality to the army of Abraham, and afforded him a great abundance of such things as were necessary."¹⁵² And Philo says that "He brings forth bread and wine which the Ammonites and Moabites would not give to him when he saw them. For water let him bring forth wine, and give them to drink, and strengthen their souls."¹⁵³ And this is not inconsistent with another place of Philo, where he says that "Melchisedek on seeing Abraham,—stretched forth his hands to heaven, and honoured him with prayers, and offered the sacrifices of thanksgiving for the victory, and splendidly entertained all who had

* VII. 4-7.

¹⁵¹ "Melchisedec rex Salem protulit panem et vinum. Fuit autem sacerdos Dei summi; et benedixit ei."—De Doct. Christ. IV. xxi.; III. iii. "Sed plane tunc benedictus est a Melchisedec, qui erat sacerdos Dei excelsi."—De Civ. Dei, XVI. xxii. VII. 500.

¹⁵² ἐχωρήγησε δὲ τῷ Ἀβραμῷ στρατῷ ξένια, καὶ πολλὰν ἀφθονίαν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων παρέχεε.—Ant. I. x. 2.

¹⁵³ ἄρτους γὰρ καὶ οἶνον προσφέρει, ἅπερ Ἀμμωνῖται καὶ Μωβῖται τῷ βλέποντι παρεχέει οὐκ ἠθέλησαν. Ἀντὶ ὕδατος οἶνον προσφερέτω, καὶ ποτιζέτω, καὶ ἀκρατιζέτω.—Legis Alleg. Lib. 2, Colon. Allob. 1617, 57, G. 58. B.

taken part in the contest:”¹⁵⁴ for although by saying “the sacrifices,” he seems to intimate a custom on such an occasion, and he certainly says that Melchisedek did sacrifice on this, it is most agreeable to his words to understand that, the sacrifices being offered by Melchisedek as priest, the large and generous hospitality which he showed was from his wealth as a king. At all events, sacrifices, according to Philo, having been offered, —and indeed, it would seem most likely, because, most accordant with the religious character of the two personages who were principally concerned, that sacrifices were offered,—the entertainment followed. Bread and wine certainly formed part of the entertainment, but there is nothing to show that they were either a part or the whole of the previous sacrifice.

The result also is the same, if the Hebrew particle be taken for a causal conjunction, and we should therefore read: “he brought forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the Most High God”: for this would only prove that the bread and wine were connected with his priestly office, and had relation to the sacrifices which he was accustomed to offer. It would not prove more than that they were an adjunct to his sacrifice, and most certainly could not prove, that his sacrifices consisted, as some contend, of bread and wine only.

But all the while, there is a considerable oversight in the arguments of those who will have it, that it was because Melchisedek was a priest that he brought forth or offered bread and wine. The syllogism necessary to produce this conclusion requires a premiss, which has only to be stated, to show how little grounds that conclusion has. It must be laid down that every priest brought forth or offered bread and wine, in order to deduce from the fact of Melchisedek being a priest, that therefore he brought forth or offered these things. That he did bring forth bread and wine, and that he was a priest, we are plainly told: but that the action was the consequence of the office, can only be proved by the intervention of a statement so absurd, as that everyone is a priest who brings forth bread and wine. The sentence, therefore, to which the particle is joined, is not a “causal sentence,” and consequently the particle is not a “causal conjunction,” but is a “copulative”: the result being, that we should read the passage as it is in our authorised English; which is confirmed by the Septuagint, and as it

¹⁵⁴ τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείνας εἰς οὐρανὸν, εὐχαῖς αὐτὸν γεραίρει, καὶ τὰ ἐπιβόια ἔθει, καὶ πάντας τοὺς συναραμένους τῷ ἀγῶνι λαμπρῶς εἰστιά.—De Abrahamo, Frankfort, 1691, 382, B.C., De Abrahamo, 299 D.

appears from Walton, by the Syriac and Arabic, and by the Targum of Onkelos: "He brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the Most High God. And he blessed" "Abraham."

Again, there can be no doubt of this last fact of the blessing: but to turn this into a demonstration that Melchisedek offered a sacrifice of the bread and wine which he brought forth to him, requires another premiss, which, I suppose, no one would accept. A king may bless, and a priest may bless; anyone may bless those who are inferior to them: * but one cannot admit an assertion, that the authority to bless another was ever confined to persons who offered a sacrifice of bread and wine.

Now it is most probable, as has been admitted, that Melchisedek offered sacrifice on meeting Abraham. It belonged to his office of priest to offer sacrifices: "for every priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins."† And on an occasion of so great importance and interest, we may well believe that Melchisedek exercised his office. But still this is only a probability. And however probable it may be thought, that his sacrifice was the bread and wine, either by themselves, or with something else, or that they were an adjunct to the sacrifice of something else: the original probability of his having offered any sacrifice at all on the occasion remains the same. It is not in the least stronger. So that we have only probability depending on probability for any connection whatever of the bread and wine with sacrifice. But probability may be in direct opposition to fact. How probable appeared to the Pharisees the reasons and purposes for which they thought that our Lord received sinners and ate with them: and yet the truth of the fact made the supposed reasons the more inconsistent with the reality. He did receive sinners; but it was to convert them from their sins, not to encourage them in them. To build any doctrine, therefore, on mere probability, is to build upon a very uncertain and fallacious foundation. Not even the strongest probability can be a foundation for Christian doctrine: for doctrine is to be founded on the certain truth of God's word alone.

It is no more than probable that Melchisedek offered sacrifice at the time in question: but the Scripture tells us not that he did. We are only told that he brought forth bread and wine.

* Heb. vii. 7.

† Heb. v. 1.

Nor are we anywhere told that these things were ever used alone as a sacrifice to the Most High God: that a sacrifice of bread and wine only was ever ordained or accepted by Him. On the contrary, the first sacrifice of which we have any account represents the offering of the fruits of the ground, as having obtained no "respect" from God: and bread and wine must be reckoned in the same class. Why the offering of Cain was not accepted, is variously accounted for, as by Philo, who says that he was guilty of "a double crime of a lover of himself: one, in that after some days he gave thanks to God, instead of continually; the other, in that he offered of the fruits, but not of the first fruits." And in this he represents Cain as acting "from himself and from his own understanding."¹⁵⁵ Thus he agrees with the infallible statement of Scripture, that Cain offered not in faith. But the history itself discloses in what respect faith was wanting in his offering. "The Lord said unto Cain,—If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door."* That is, "If thou be righteous," or "If thou offerest sacrifice rightly, thou shalt be accepted: but I have not had respect unto thee or to thy offering, and thus testify to thee, as thy conscience also testifies, that thou doest not well, and that sin, therefore, lieth at the door": which last expression means, either, that sin prevented his being accepted, and must be taken away, before God would have respect to him; or that a sin offering was lying at the door; that he had it in his power to offer a sacrifice which would be accepted as an atonement for his sin.¹⁵⁶ And whichever of these two interpretations be accepted, and I believe they are the only ones which can be proposed, they will come to the same thing with regard to our present question. They both charge Cain with sin, as Abel had sin, or as a positive evil doer, and as having not offered a sacrifice which would be accepted as an atonement for his sin. But Abel's sacrifice was accepted; and in the "respect" which God had "to him and to his offering," "he obtained witness that he was righteous," that God had taken away his sin. And in the difference between the sacrifices of the brothers, which expressed the faith of the one and the unbelief of the other, is to be seen the cause of the accept-

¹⁵⁵ δύο ἐγκλήματα τοῦ φιλαύτου· ἐν μὲν τὸ μεθ' ἡμέρας, ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐθὺς εὐχαριστῆσαι τῷ Θεῷ; ἕτερον δὲ, τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων καρπῶν ὧν σύνθετον ὄνομα πρωτογενήματα.—ὁ δὲ ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὸν ἴδιον νοῦν.—De Sacrif. Abelis et Caini, p. 107, B. A.

* Gen. iv. 7. See Appendix G G.

¹⁵⁶ See a learned disquisition on the place in the Sermons of the late Alexander Nicolls, Reg. Prof. of Hebrew, Oxford, Sermon 6, Oxford, 1830.

ance of Abel's sacrifice, and the rejection of Cain's. That difference was, that in Abel's sacrifice there was "a shedding of blood;" but in Cain's sacrifice there was not. This was the characteristic and essential difference between the two oblations. There was sin in Abel as well as in Cain: but by shedding of blood, Abel obtained remission of sins: there was no shedding of blood by Cain, and therefore his sin remained. "Without shedding of blood is no remission," is a principle that extended to the whole system of sacrifice. "It is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul."* The sin of Cain laid at the door: unatoned sin prevented his acceptance with God. Whatever probability, therefore, there may be conceived to be in the theory, that Melchisedek's supposed sacrifice was of bread and wine; it is much more than counterbalanced by the probability that it was not.

The conclusion is, that while it is very probable, that Melchisedek did offer sacrifice on meeting Abraham after the slaughter of the kings, it is not certain that he did; but that if he did, it is not and cannot be proved by anything like sufficient evidence, and is indeed very improbable, that his sacrifice was bread and wine.

It would seem almost superfluous now, to deal with the assertion, that a priest after the order of Melchisedek must be one who sacrifices bread and wine: for since it cannot be proved that such was his sacrifice, neither can it be proved that such also must be the sacrifice of a priest after his order. But as it is an assertion which has been so long, so often, and so confidently made, it will be well to consider whether, even if Melchisedek did sacrifice bread and wine, it must be an essential characteristic of his order to offer the same sacrifice; so that our Lord could not be a priest after the order of Melchisedek, if He did not offer a sacrifice of bread and wine.

Now one would think that the very words, "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek," would show in what respect it was, that the priesthood of our Lord and the priesthood of Melchisedek essentially corresponded to each other. The sacred history brings Melchisedek before us as king and priest. No mention is made of his departure, or of his death: but according to the interpretation followed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, he "abideth a priest continually." The priesthood of Melchisedek was a continual priesthood, a priesthood without ending.

* Heb. ix. 22; Lev. xvii. 11.

And so the priesthood of Christ being after this order, He is “a priest for ever.”

But the theory of a material sacrifice in the Eucharist has led its advocates to overlook this, and to maintain, that it is especially by offering a sacrifice of bread and wine, that our Lord is a priest after the order of Melchisedek; and to contend moreover, in consequence, that the first and second order of the Christian ministry are also priests after this order.

Some of the Fathers seem to have had such an opinion: and Archdeacon Wilberforce distinctly asserts it. Speaking of our Lord’s “unchangeable priesthood,” he fails to recognise it as the proof, or as at all proving, that our Lord is “a priest after the order of Melchisedek”; and discovers such proof, as it would seem exclusively, in the identity of the sacrifices which he assumes to have been offered by Melchisedek and by our Lord after him. He argues that “Priesthood implies a sacrifice”: that Christ being “a Priest after the order of Melchisedek,” his sacrifice must be of “the nature of Melchisedek’s sacrifice”: that Melchisedek’s sacrifice was bread and wine: that our Lord offered that sacrifice in the institution of the Eucharist: and “thus—initiated that Priesthood of Melchisedek, which His Apostles were ordained to perpetuate.”* So also Bishop Jolly says: “This perpetual priesthood of His, which is after the order of Melchisedek, and not of Aaron, He committed in delegation, and as far as earth required it, to His Apostles.”†

Whereas, in the first place, the offering of bread and wine in sacrifice, was not peculiar to Melchisedek, if such was his sacrifice. It was an appointed rite of the Aaronic priesthood, to offer meat-offerings and drink-offerings: the latter consisting of wine; and the former being of flour for its constituent part, either with salt only, or also with oil and frankincense. Therefore, although the Aaronic priests offered bloody sacrifices, they did not offer bloody sacrifices only, but they offered unbloody sacrifices also. Nor can they be proved to be of a different order of priesthood from that of Melchisedek, by the species of their sacrifices, unless it can be proved that Melchisedek did not offer bloody, as well as unbloody sacrifices. If this cannot be proved, both orders must be considered to be on an equality with regard to the kind of their sacrifices.¹⁵⁷ And if it was

* Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, c. xi. pp. 353, 354. See also p. 65.

† On the Christian Sacrifice, p. 186.

¹⁵⁷ “Qui vero Aaronem aliis rebus, “They who determine that Aaron and
aliis Melchisedecum ad sacrificia usum Melchisedek used different sacrifices from

necessary that our Lord should sacrifice bread and wine, so that He might be a priest after the order of Melchisedek; that sacrifice would show him to be of the order of Aaron also: for Aaron and his sons offered like sacrifices. It cannot, therefore, be successfully maintained that the sacrifices, which it was the office of Melchisedek to make, were bread and wine only; or that the sacrifice of bread and wine belonged only to his order of priesthood.

Moreover, the Epistle to the Hebrews, in commenting on the priesthood of Christ, and showing it to be of the order of Melchisedek, does not refer, in any way, to the nature of Melchisedek's sacrifice; or suggest or sanction the supposition that the sacrifice of bread and wine was peculiar to him. On the contrary, the apostle says that Melchisedek "being—without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually": and "that after the similitude of Melchisedek there ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life."¹⁵⁸ Some appear to have thought that the

judicant, Aaronem iis, quæ ante diximus, animalibus perinde ac inanimis, Melchisedecum nihil nisi pane et vino, hi sane, quantum mihi videtur, quare sic judicant, nihil habent. Panem hic et vinum Abrahamo et vernis ejus jam ex itinere, prælioque fessis ad vires reficiendas dedit. Similemque simili in causa morem finitimis fuisse regionibus non obscure docet historia sacra (Deut. xxiii. 4, et Jud. viii. 5, 6, 15): neque Melchisedecus sacerdos dicitur, quia panem illum et vinum protulit, sed ut hinc quisque intelligeret, quid factum erat, ut Abrahamo solemniter ritu benediceret, (id quod sacerdotis fuit,) Deut. xxi. 5, et 1 Par. xxiii. 13, et Num. vi. 23) tum etiam, quare Abrahamus spoliatorum decimas ei dederat.—Nihil ergo est, cur Melchisedecum pane solummodo atque vino, nihil, quare rebus tantum inanimis sacrificasse arbitremur. Imo vero est, quamobrem contra judicemus. Si enim a sacerdotio ejus aliena fuissent cruenta sacra, quid factum est, ut ipse Christus, cujus idem, quod Melchisedeci fuit, sacerdotii genus esse dicitur, sanguine suo sacrificaret?"—Outram, De Sacrificiis, II. i. ii. pp. 288, 289, Lond. 1677 (372).

each other, that Aaron used those which we have before mentioned, animal and inanimate sacrifices alike; that Melchisedek used nothing but bread and wine; these certainly, so far as I can see, have no reason why they so determine. He here gave bread and wine to Abraham and his servants now wearied with their journey and battle, to recruit their strength. And that the neighbouring countries had a like custom on like occasions the sacred history clearly teaches. Nor is Melchisedek called a priest, because he brought forth that bread and wine, but that from his being so called every one might understand how it came to pass, that he blessed Abraham in solemn rite, as it belonged to a priest to do: and also for what reason it was, that Abraham gave him tithes of the spoils. No reason therefore is there, why we should think that Melchisedek sacrificed exclusively with bread and wine; no reason to think that he sacrificed with inanimate things only. But just the reverse: there is reason why we should determine the contrary. For if bloody rites had been alien to his priesthood, how comes it, that Christ Himself, whose priesthood is said to be of the same kind as that of Melchisedek, should sacrifice with His own blood?"

¹⁵⁸ Œcumenius well says: "See what he saith: We know not, saith he, whom Melchisedek had for father or mother, or of what race he was, nor when he was born or

omission of the parentage and descent of Melchisedek might be taken, according to this way of interpretation, as foreshadowing the mystery of the incarnation: but this appears to be inconsistent with the Epistle itself, which speaks, on the one hand, in such glowing terms of Christ being the Son of God; and on the other, of his being of "the seed of Abraham," of "the tribe of Judah;"* and therefore as of one whose parentage and descent were well known. "It is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah": and it is therefore impossible to maintain, that there is any typical correspondence to Him in Melchisedek's being "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life." He was born, as all Christians know, of the Virgin Mary, and died upon the cross. The single point of resemblance in Melchisedek to Christ, the only point of which the Epistle to the Hebrews takes any notice, is the continual, enduring priesthood. There is not the remotest allusion to any sacrifice of Melchisedek; nor is there to any sacrifice of our Lord, but the sacrifice of Himself. The great feature of resemblance in the priesthood of Christ to the priesthood of Melchisedek, is its perpetual endurance. As there was no end related or assigned to the priesthood of Melchisedek, so there shall be no end to the priesthood of Him whom he thus foreshadowed. There is no intimation of any other point of resemblance, excepting the royal titles, which do not concern this question. And if any resemblance was designed between the bread and wine which Melchisedek brought forth, and the bread and wine in which our Lord instituted the

died. And what is this to the purpose? some one will say. For although we do not know these things, since they are not related in Scripture, yet he had both father, and race, and birth and death. How then is such a one without father, and having neither beginning nor end of life? And he answers: Forasmuch as Melchisedek, since his genealogy is not recounted by the Scripture, does not appear to us who know it not, to have parents, or beginning or ending of life; so Christ in real truth. For as we know not the beginning or end of Melchisedek, so in reality we know not the beginning or end of Christ. But this of Melchisedek, since it is not written, but of Christ, because in truth He had them not. For a type is not in everything conformable to the truth, (since it would then be found itself to be the truth, and the very thing, rather than the type:) but it has certain images and resemblances. For example: Melchisedek, on account of our ignorance, is said to be without father; Christ in His lower nature is without father. Melchisedek without mother; Christ without mother in His higher nature, in which neither had He beginning of days: for how could He have [time] who is the maker of times? And so thou shalt understand that all things which Melchisedek had, so far as in our ignorance of the particulars about him [we can speak], these Christ has in truth. If Melchisedek, in the bare names only, was king of peace and righteousness, yet Christ was this in very truth.—

"'But being made like to the Son of God.' Now in what was the likeness? In that both of him and of Christ, the end and the beginning are not known: of him, because they are not written; but of Christ, because He had no ending or beginning."—In Ep. ad Heb. c. ix.; Commentar. Lut. Par. 1631, II. 364.

* I. 1, &c.; ii. 16; vii. 14.

Eucharist; and if the resemblance were of so great moment, that it was by this use of the bread and wine that our Lord was shown to be a priest after the order of Melchisedek: it is most unaccountable that no notice whatever of this was taken, when it was the purpose of the inspired writer to show that our Lord was of that order. But when it is considered that Melchisedek brought forth the viands, and gave them to Abraham and his host, merely as bread and wine: whereas our Lord gave the elements not as bread and wine, but as his body and blood: although there be a seeming, yet there is no real, resemblance to be found between the feast which Melchisedek made for Abraham, and that which our Lord instituted for his Church.

A coincidence, a remarkable coincidence, one may readily perceive and admit; that as Melchisedek brought forth bread and wine for bodily sustenance or refreshment; so our Lord used bread and wine for the Sacrament of our spiritual nourishment: and thus the former may be accepted as a kind of figure of the latter. Nay more: if Melchisedek offered sacrifice on the occasion, and the bread and wine were his sacrifice, or part of his sacrifice, or an adjunct to it: his sacrifice was over, when he gave the bread and wine to Abraham and his people to eat. The sacrifice having been offered, the feast began: and in it the priest blessed the father of the faithful. So our great High Priest, not probably, but infallibly, representing his sacrifice as offered, brought forth bread and wine, blessing his faithful people; and by bread and wine, giving to them, not these beggarly elements, but even his body and his blood. These are the things He gives, and not bread and wine only as did Melchisedek.

On the omission in the Epistle to the Hebrews of all mention of a sacrifice of Melchisedek, and of any allusion to it, and on such an argument as has here been drawn from that omission; Johnson remarks that the "argument proves too much; for if the Apostle's omission of Melchisedec's offering bread and wine be an argument that he did not offer them; it may as well from thence be proved, that his bringing forth bread and wine was not a type of the Eucharist at all, even though it be considered barely as a religious feast."* Now our argument is, not, that Melchisedek did not offer or sacrifice bread and wine; but that it is not proved that he did. And there is, obviously, a great difference between the two propositions: and I must

* Unbloody Sacrifice, I. 126, Part 1, c. 2.

think that the latter has been clearly and fully established: and that the various proofs and arguments brought to establish the assertion that he did offer such a sacrifice, have nothing like a clear and certain foundation in Holy Scripture.

Again, it has not been proved that Melchisedek's bringing forth bread and wine is a type of the Eucharist. We may accept the coincidence, as has been said; but that one is a type of the other, is far from certain: that is to say, if a type be not a fortuitous correspondence in a thing to something future, but a thing or person found to have a resemblance, clearly intended by Divine wisdom, to some thing or person in the developments of providence or grace.¹⁵⁹

That Melchisedek himself was a type of Christ in respect of his priesthood, we know from the Epistle to the Hebrews; but we have no authority for asserting that his actions were typical of the actions of Christ: that he being a priest, his bringing forth of bread and wine for the entertainment or refreshment of Abraham and his people, was typical, was intended to be a prophetic representation, of our Lord's using bread and wine for the symbols of his body and blood.¹⁶⁰ We have no authority for exalting the bread and wine of Melchisedek into the rank of a type of the bread and wine of the Eucharist, or of making the action of Melchisedek typical of the action of our Lord; from the same things being used in both cases. We cannot say that the use of the same things establishes the relation of type and antitype.¹⁶¹ Nor is it every coincidence, correspondence, or resemblance that can do this. A clear indication of the will of the Almighty, either by a prophetic or by an explanatory declara-

¹⁵⁹ Bishop Van Mildert, as cited by Horne (Introd. II. 155) says: "It is essential to a type, in the scriptural acceptance of the term, that there should be a competent evidence of the divine *intention* in the correspondence between it and the antitype,—a matter not left to the imagination of the expositor to discover, but resting on some solid proof from Scripture itself, that this was really the case."—Bampton Lectures, p. 239.

"No person or thing in the Old Testament is ever interpreted in the New Testament as typical or prophetic of Christ, except on the ground of the express words of the Old Testament concerning them, and that the very form in which the Holy Spirit puts His narrative belongs inseparably and essentially to the prophecy."—Delitzsch on Heb. vii. 1-3, Clarke's Foreign Library, Edinburgh, 1868, I. 332.

Bishop Van Mildert says that a type is "a prefigurative action or occurrence, in which one event, person, or circumstance, is intended to represent another, similar to it in certain respects, but future and distant."—Bampton Lectures, vii. 237. He also says that "sometimes the type differs no otherwise from a simple prophecy, than its being delivered by significant actions or gestures instead of words."

¹⁶⁰ The bread and wine are types of our Lord's body and blood, whatever they may be more: but to make the bread and wine of Melchisedek an intended prefiguration of the Eucharist, is to say that they are types of types; a thing which I believe to be unknown to Scripture.

¹⁶¹ Otherwise, Abigail's bringing bread and wine to David would be a type of the Eucharist, 1 Sam. xxv. 18.

tion, is necessary to constitute such a relation. That only is a type, which is clearly intended by the Almighty, as in the case of Ezekiel;* or is declared in Scripture, as in the case of Jonah; † to be a prefiguration of some action, thing, or person, in the dispensations of providence, or in the economy of grace. A type, in short, is a visible prophecy; a prophecy addressed to the sight, as other prophecies are addressed to the hearing. Ambrose says: "Typus est umbra veritatis: a type is a shadow of the truth."—De Fide III. v. Cyril Alex.: "Simulacrum veritatis importat: it imports an image of the truth."

Johnson seems to have thought that the opinions of the Fathers were sufficient authority for taking the bread and wine of Melchisedek for a type of the Eucharist: but this could not be maintained until it were demonstrated, that the unrevealed intentions of the Most High can be fathomed and declared by the mere power and authority of men. But the opinions of the Fathers on this question shall be noticed presently, when another argument of this author on the omission, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, of all mention of a sacrifice of Melchisedek, shall have been considered.

He says: "this seeming argument proves too much on another account, I mean, because it would prove that our Saviour never performed any act of the Melchisedecian priesthood: for if the Apostle's silence concerning the oblation of bread and wine be of sufficient validity to prove that none was offered; then his omission of the particular priestly action or actions, wherein Christ was prefigured by Melchisedek, will as effectually prove that Christ did, in no action performed by Him, execute the functions of a priest according to that order." ‡ Now the argument from "the Apostle's silence," it must be again noticed, is not, that Melchisedek did not offer a sacrifice: but that if he did, and if his supposed sacrifice was so peculiar and essential to his order, that Christ could not have been a priest after the order of Melchisedek, without offering a like sacrifice: "the Apostle's silence" would be most unaccountable. True it is, that the object which the apostle had in view was to show, as Bellarmine says, how much greater the priesthood of Christ was than the priesthood of the law, from his being "a priest after the order of Melchisedek," who was so much greater than Abraham, and therefore than any of the Aaronic priesthood which descended from him, that Melchisedek received tithes from him, and

* IV. 3; xii. 6; xxiv. 24. † Mat. xii. 40. ‡ Unbloody Sacrifice, I. ii. 1, 127.

blessed him. But if a sacrifice offered by Melchisedek was a type of a sacrifice offered by our Lord, and if to constitute Him "a priest after the order of Melchisedek," it was necessary that He should offer the same kind of sacrifice which is attributed to Melchisedek; there would have been a very important and practical argument, the neglect or omission of which would be very improbable and unaccountable. For since the priesthood of Melchisedek was superior to the Levitical, his sacrifices would also be better than any sacrifices offered by the sons of Aaron. And if his sacrifices were bread and wine only, then they were better than "all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices" that were offered by the law. And if a continuing priesthood be greater than an order whose members are always changing by reason of death; the order of Melchisedek would be yet greater by reason of the power of its sacrifices. If, therefore, Melchisedek made a sacrifice of bread and wine, and this sacrifice was typical of a sacrifice of bread and wine to be offered by Christ, and it was necessary that He should offer that sacrifice in order to his being "a priest after the order of Melchisedek"; it is absolutely incredible, and indeed impossible, that no mention should be made of Melchisedek's sacrifice, when the sacred writer was showing how much greater his priesthood was than the priesthood of the law; since his sacrifice of bread and wine would have been of so much greater power than all the sacrifices of bullocks, and rams, and he-goats, which were offered by the law year by year continually. It is the sacrifice which gives effect to the priesthood; and by the power of the sacrifices is the power of the priesthood to be estimated.

Whatever sacrifices, indeed, Melchisedek was accustomed to offer, they would be typical and prefigurative of the sacrifice of Christ's death, as were the sacrifices of the law: but that Melchisedek offered a sacrifice of bread and wine only, and that this sacrifice was typical of another sacrifice of bread and wine to be made by Christ; and that consequently, Christ did offer a sacrifice of bread and wine: are very different questions and not at all necessarily connected with each other, or to be inferred one from the other. Nay, if there be any meaning in the statements, that Christ offered up sacrifice "once, when He offered up Himself"; that He "was once offered to bear the sins of many"; that He "offered one sacrifice for sins"; and that "by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that

are sanctified":* the typical relation of sacrifices offered by Melchisedek, was to our Lord's sacrifice of Himself, and not to any other sacrifice. This sacrifice had not the remotest type in the alleged sacrifice of Melchisedek. And it is of the power of his sacrifice by the shedding of his own blood, that the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the New Testament, speak: nor do they ever tell us that Christ at any time made any other sacrifice.†

To talk of his sacrificing Himself under the form, or under the species, of bread and wine, is to acknowledge that it was not the bread and wine which He sacrificed, but Himself: while it is to assert a false theology by the terms of a false and childish philosophy, which nothing could have made men of understanding endure or employ, but the necessity of appearing to substantiate in argument, that which the very terms themselves in reality disproved. For if our Lord sacrificed Himself under the form or species of bread and wine, then in reality and naked truth, He made no sacrifice at all at the time, sacrificing neither the bread and wine, nor Himself.

The argument that "if the Apostle's silence concerning the oblation of bread and wine" by Melchisedek "be of sufficient validity to prove that none was offered; then his omission of the particular priestly action or actions, wherein Christ was prefigured by Melchisedek, will as effectually prove that Christ did, in no action performed by Him, execute the functions of a priest according to that order": does not put the case fairly. So far, no doubt, as this particular part of the Epistle to the Hebrews goes, exclusively of all the rest of Scripture, the silence of the writer will prove as much in one case as in the other: but, on the one hand, no sacrifice of Melchisedek is ever spoken of in other parts of Scripture: while the New Testament is full of the sacrifice of Christ, and the Old Testament is full of types and prophecies of it. And if, here, in the very place where the resemblance of our Lord to Melchisedek is specially traced, no mention is found of a sacrifice of Melchisedek; it is most certain that such a sacrifice cannot be proved to have been offered by him on meeting Abraham: and it must also be concluded, that if he did offer a sacrifice at that time, the kind of sacrifice is not so essential to the order of his priesthood, that our Lord could not be a priest after that order, if He did not offer a like sacrifice. If a sacrifice of bread and wine was essential and peculiar to the order of Melchisedek, it was essential to the proof that our Lord was a priest after that order, to declare the

* Heb. vii. 27; ix. 23; x. 12, 14.

† See Appendix II H.

type and its fulfilment. But nothing of the kind was done: and, therefore, the only conclusion is, that whatever sacrifice Melchisedek may have offered, it has no such character as is ascribed to it; that it was neither peculiar to Melchisedek, nor necessary for our Lord to offer it.

Whereas, taking Melchisedek himself for a type of Christ in the continuance and perpetuity of his priesthood, in the one offering of our Lord by Himself, taking away the sin of the world, and never again to offer it, inasmuch as eternal redemption was its fruit;* we find an act of that priesthood of which all the sacrifices, which Melchisedek did offer, would be types.

It is the perpetuity of our Lord's priesthood, which makes Him a priest after the order of Melchisedek, and not any similarity between sacrifices offered by Melchisedek, and any sacrifice of Christ, but that of Himself. Melchisedek "abideth a priest continually": Christ "after the power of an endless life—hath an unchangeable priesthood": and thus it is that He is "a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek."¹⁶²

Bellarmino, indeed, pleads that "the Apostle purposely omitted the oblation of bread and wine, lest he should be compelled to unfold the mystery of the Eucharist, which was deeper than that it could then be understood by the Hebrews. For so Paul himself says, ch. 5, *of whom we have much to say, and hard to be intelligibly uttered: because you are become weak to hear.*† And truly when the Apostle plainly expounded all things which are said of Melchisedec in Genesis, except the oblation of bread and wine, it does not seem possible to be denied, that by a discourse hard to be intelligibly uttered, for which the Hebrews were not sufficient, must be understood the mystery of the Eucharist."¹⁶³ But this is an argument suited to very simple people indeed. It was as easy a thing as possible, to say and to understand,

* Heb. vii. 27; ix. 10, 12.

¹⁶² There are also the parallel actions, that Melchisedek brought forth bread and wine: and our Lord brought forth the same things. But this does not make the one action typical of the other.

It has been contended that the first and second orders of the Christian ministry are priests after the order of Melchisedek, from using in the Eucharist the elements of bread and wine. But this they cannot be, since they are no more "suffered to continue by reason of death" (Heb. vii. 20), than the sons of Aaron, and have not an abiding priesthood.

† Rheims version.

¹⁶³ "Apostolus dedita opera omisit oblationem panis et vini, ne cogeretur explicare mysterium Eucharistiæ, quod altius erat, quam ut ab illis capi tunc posset. Sic enim ipse Paulus dicit, cap. 5: *De quo (Melchisedec) grandis nobis sermo, et ininterpretabilis ad dicendum, quoniam imbecilles facti estis ad audiendum.* Et sane cum Apostolus omnia plane exposuerit, quæ de Melchisedec dicuntur in Genesi, excepta oblatione panis et vini, non videtur posse negari, quin per sermonem ininterpretabilem, cui non erant idonei Hebræi, intelligi debeat mysterium Eucharistiæ."—De Missa, l. vi. 729.

that Melchisedek offered a sacrifice of bread and wine, if he did offer such a sacrifice; and that Christ fulfilled this type, by a sacrifice also of bread and wine, if He did offer such a sacrifice; and that He was thus a priest after the order of Melchisedek. There would have been no kind of necessity to expound the mystery of the Eucharist: for that mystery is not in a sacrifice of the bread and wine, but in their being the body and blood of Christ. And even if there would have been a necessity to expound the mystery of the Eucharist, the apostle spoke of mysteries at least as great, when he spoke of the eternal Sonship, the Divine Majesty, and the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Nor is it the way of Scripture or particularly of the apostle himself, to refrain from speaking of mysteries or things hard to be understood: for there are "things which the angels desire to look into," and it is testified that the apostle "in all his Epistles" spoke of things, some of which are "hard to be understood" and liable to be wrested, in common with the other Scriptures, by the "unlearned and unstable—unto their own destruction."*

* 1 Pet. i. 12; 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

CHAPTER VI.

OPINIONS OF THE ANCIENT FATHERS ON MELCHISEDEK'S
ALLEGED SACRIFICE.

THE enquiry is now to be made, what the opinions of the Ancient Fathers were on this subject of Melchisedek's alleged sacrifice of bread and wine. But these objections present themselves at the outset: that, as is undeniable, there is no mention throughout the whole Bible, of any sacrifice of Melchisedek, at least as a sacrifice; and that, as has been, I must think, made clear, there is absolutely no proof whatever, that he did offer a sacrifice of bread and wine on meeting Abraham: and that though the imagination of various writers may have discovered parallel actions, coincidences, and similitudes; the authority of the Fathers is not sufficient to make the actions of Melchisedek typical of the actions of Christ, or his sacrifices typical of any sacrifice of Christ, but the sacrifice of Himself. Within their proper sphere, as witnesses to the teaching of our Lord and his Apostles, and of the Church in their times; their authority is most valuable and important. But it is not an independent or original authority: that only is in the teaching of which they are witnesses.¹⁶⁴ Nor are they competent to add anything to the doctrine of our Lord and his apostles, as recorded and delivered to us in the writings of the New Testament.

A distinction, also, must be made, between opinions or doctrines delivered merely as their own, and those which they ascribe to the Church, to the apostles, or to our Lord Himself.¹⁶⁵ And while the opinions of one or a few of the Fathers, however eminent, are not to be taken for the doctrine of the Church:

¹⁶⁴ "There is no point of Christian doctrine which is not attested and laid down in the New Testament. The Church cannot receive any teaching which does not find its justification in the Bible, and is not—at least, indicated and implied in the New Testament in premisses of which it is the logical sequel."—Döllinger, *Christenthum und Kirche*, in the *Academy*, No. 3, p. 67.

¹⁶⁵ "The tradition of the blessed doctrine derived directly from the holy Apostles, Peter, James, John, and Paul, the son receiving it from the father."—Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. i.

yet whatever they all agree in, explicitly or implicitly, from the very first, must be accepted with confidence. Such is the case with the Creeds, infant baptism, female communion, the observance of the Lord's day. Such is not the case with regard to the mixed chalice, lights for signification, and many other things, which are fondly embraced as Catholic by some few members of the Church of England.

Bearing these observations, then, in mind, let us examine what the opinions of the Fathers on the subject in hand really were, and what they amount to.

1. CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, in the last decade of the second century, is the earliest I can find cited about Melchisedek. He says:—

“Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the Most High God, who gave wine and bread, the sanctified nourishment, for a type of the Eucharist.”¹⁶⁶

First, he calls the bread and wine brought by Melchisedek, “sanctified nourishment”: and this Bellarmine will have to mean, by having been offered to God. But St. Paul teaches that the “creature of God”—“is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.”* And therefore “sanctified nourishment” does not necessarily mean food that has been brought either as an oblation or as a sacrifice to God. Secondly, Clemens says that Melchisedek gave “the sanctified nourishment for a type of the Eucharist”: which is to be considered together with some similar statements of others.

2. CYPRIAN, about the middle of the third century, says:—

“In the priest Melchisedec we see the mystery of the sacrifice of the Lord prefigured, as the Divine Scripture testifies and says, ‘And Melchisedec king of Salem brought forth bread and wine; but he was the priest of the Most High God, and blessed Abraham.’ But that Melchisedec bore a type of Christ, the Holy Spirit declares in the Psalms, saying in the person of the Father to the Son, ‘Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.’ Which order certainly is this, coming from that sacrifice and thence descending, that Melchisedec was a priest of the Most High God, that he offered bread and wine, that he blessed Abraham. For who is more a priest of the Most High God than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered a sacrifice to God the Father, and offered this same which Melchisedec had offered, that is, bread and wine, namely, His own

¹⁶⁶ Μελχισεδέκ, βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, ὁ τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸν ἄρτον, τὴν ἡγιασμένην διδοὺς τροφήν, εἰς τύπον Εὐχαριστίας.—Stromat. iv.; 539 Paris, 541.

* 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5.

body and blood? And that blessing going before with respect to Abraham belonged to our people.”¹⁶⁷

And a little further on:—

“In Genesis, therefore, that the blessing of Abraham by Melchisedec the priest might be duly celebrated, the image of the sacrifice of Christ precedes, appointed namely in bread and wine; which thing the Lord, accomplishing and fulfilling, offered bread and the cup mixed with wine, and He who is the fulness of truth, fulfilled the truth of the prefigured image.”¹⁶⁸

St. Cyprian, then, taught, first, that “in Melchisedec the mystery of the sacrifice of our Lord” was “prefigured”: secondly, that “Melchisedec bore a type of Christ”: thirdly, that the things in which the typical correspondence between Melchisedek and Christ consisted, were, that Melchisedek was a priest of the Most High God, that he offered bread and wine, and that he blessed Abraham: fourthly, that our “Lord Jesus Christ” is also a priest of the Most High God; and that the sacrifice which He offered to God the Father, is “that same which Melchisedec had offered, that is, bread and wine, namely, His own body and blood”: fifthly, that the blessing received by Abraham belongs to Christian people: sixthly, that the figure of the sacrifice of Christ preceded the blessing of Abraham: and seventhly, that the Lord accomplished and fulfilled the truth of this figure, by offering “bread and the cup mixed with wine.”

3. EUSEBIUS CÆSARIENSIS, in the second decade of the fourth century, says:—

“Jesus our Saviour, the Christ of God, after the manner of Melchisedec, still even now performs by his own ministers, the offices of the priesthood

¹⁶⁷ “In sacerdote Melchisedec sacrificii Domini sacramentum præfiguratum videmus, secundum quod Scriptura divina testatur et dicit: ‘Et Melchisedec rex Salem protulit panem et vinum, fuit autem sacerdos Dei summi, et benedixit Abraham.’ Quod autem Melchisedec typum Christi portaret, declarat in Psalmis Spiritus Sanctus, ex persona Patris ad filium dicens—Tu es sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedec.’ Quis ordo utique hic est de sacrificio illo veniens et inde descendens, quod Melchisedec sacerdos Dei summi fuit, quod panem et vinum obtulit, quod Abraham benedixit. Nam quis magis sacerdos Dei summi, quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus, qui sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, et obtulit hoc idem quod Melchisedec obtulerat, id est panem et vinum, suum scilicet corpus et sanguinem? et circa Abraham benedictio illa præcedens ad nostrum populum pertinebat.”—Ep. ad Cæcil. 63. al. 62, Oxon. p. 2, 149.

¹⁶⁸ “Ut ergo in Genesi per Melchisedec sacerdotem benedictio circa Abraham posset rite celebrari, præcedit ante imago sacrificii Christi, in pane et vino scilicet constituta; quam rem perficiens et adimplens Dominus, panem et calicem mixtum vino obtulit, et qui est plenitudo veritatis veritatem præfiguratæ imaginis adimplevit.”—Ibid. p. 150, Ep. ad Cæcil.

among men : for as Melchisedec being a priest of Gentiles, does not at all appear to have used corporeal sacrifices, but blessed Abraham with wine only and bread : in the very same manner, He, our Saviour and Lord, first, then all the priests from Him, among all the nations, fulfilling the spiritual priesthood, according to the ecclesiastical ordinances, by wine and bread, darkly intimates the mysteries of His body and saving blood, Melchisedec having foreseen these things by a divine spirit, and having used the images of the things to come." ¹⁶⁹

Eusebius, then, says : that Melchisedek is not seen to have used corporeal sacrifices : secondly, that he used wine only and bread to bless Abraham with : thirdly, that our Lord after his manner first performed the office of his priesthood : with wine and bread : fourthly, that his ministers after Him, fulfilling their spiritual priesthood throughout the world, do by wine and bread, according to the laws of the Church, darkly signify the mysteries of his body and saving blood : and fifthly, that in using bread and wine, Melchisedek acted with foreknowledge, and used the images of the things.¹⁷⁰

4. In a work imputed to AMBROSE, who wrote in the eighth decade of the fourth century, the writer says :—

"We know that the figure of these sacraments preceded the times of Abraham, when Melchisedec offered sacrifice."

And again :—

"We have said that on the altar is appointed a cup and bread, and wine is put into the cup : and what else ? water. But you say to me, How, then, did Melchisedec offer bread and wine ? what means the mixture of the water ?"

And in another work imputed to Ambrose, it is said that—

"The institution of Melchisedec remains, which is celebrated in all the world in the distribution of the sacraments." ¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁹ 'Ο Σωτήρ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς, Ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῷ τοῦ Μελχισεδέκ τῷ τρόπῳ, τὰ τῆς ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἱερωσύνης εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν διὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ θεραπειῶν ἐπιτελεῖ· ὡς περὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἱερεὺς ἐθνῶν τυγχάνων, οὐδαμοῦ φαίνεται θυσίαις σωματικαῖς κεχρημένος. οἶνῳ δὲ μόνῳ καὶ ἄρτῳ τὸν Ἀβραάμ εὐλόγων· τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον πρῶτος μὲν αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτήρ καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν, ἔπειτα οἱ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες ἱερεῖς ἀνά πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὴν πνευματικὴν ἐπιτελοῦντες κατὰ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικὸς θεσμοὺς ἱερωσύνην, οἶνῳ καὶ ἄρτῳ, τοῦ τε σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ σπυριώδη αἵματος αἰνίσσονται τὰ μυστήρια, τοῦ Μελχισεδέκ ταῦτα πνεύματι θέλω προτεθεωρηκότος, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων τοῖς εἰκόσι προκεχρημένου."—*Demonstratio Evangelica*, iii.; Paris, 1627, 223.

¹⁷⁰ On Gen. xiv. 18 Eusebius has : "Μελχισεδέκ ἐξενέγκεν ἄρτους καὶ οἶνον· ἦν δὲ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ,—καὶ εὐλόγησε τὸν Ἀβραάμ."—*Demon. Ev.* iii. 223.

¹⁷¹ "Cognovimus sacramentorum istorum figuram Abrahæ temporibus præcessisse, quando obtulit sacrificium S. Melchisedec.—Diximus quod in altari constituitur calix et panis, in calice mittitur vinum : et quid aliud ? aqua. Sed tu mihi dicis, Quomodo

This writer, then, thought that Melchisedek offered bread and wine; and that this offering was a figure of the sacraments.

5. A few years later, JEROME says:—

“Go back to Genesis, and you will find Melchisedec king of Salem, prince of this state, who even then offered bread and wine for a type of Christ, and dedicated the Christian mystery in the body and blood of the Saviour.”—“Our mystery is signified in the word of the order, not at all in irrational victims to be immolated through Aaron, but in the offered bread and wine, that is, in the body and blood of the Lord Jesus.”

And in another place he says, that—

“As Melchisedec in prefiguration of Christ had done in offering bread and wine, He Himself also intended to represent the truth of His body and blood.”¹⁷²

In the opinion of Jerome, then, Melchisedek offered bread and wine for a type of Christ: secondly, he dedicated the Christian mystery in the body and blood of the Saviour: thirdly, the Christian mystery is signified in the bread and wine offered by Melchisedek, that is, in the body and blood of our Lord: and fourthly, Melchisedek prefigured Christ in offering bread and wine.

6. AUGUSTINE wrote at the end of the fourth century. He says:—

“Melchisedec, in bringing forth the sacrament of the Lord’s Table, knew how to figure His eternal priesthood”:

That in the benediction of Abraham by Melchisedek—

“first appeared the sacrifice which is now offered by Christians in the whole world.”—“They who read know what Melchisedec brought forth when he blessed Abraham: and if now they are partakers of it, they see such a sacrifice at this time offered to God in all the world.”¹⁷³

ergo Melchisedec panem et vinum obtulit? quid sibi vult admistio aquæ?—Constat manere Melchisedec institutum, quod toto orbe terrarum in sacramentorum erogatione celebratur.—*De Sacramentis*, V. i.; in *Heb. v.*; Paris, 1632, II. 367–369.

¹⁷² Recurre ad *Genesis*, et Melchisedec regem Salem, hujus principem invenies civitatis: qui jam tunc in typo Christi panem et vinum obtulit, et mysterium Christianum in Salvatoris corpore et sanguine dedicavit.—*Ad Marcellum*, 547. “Mysterium nostrum in verbo ordinis significatur: nequaquam per Aaron irrationalibus victimis immolandis, sed oblato pane et vino, id est, corpore et sanguine Domini Jesu.”—*Quæst. in Gen. ii.* 520. “Ut quomodo in præfiguratione Ejus Melchisedec, summi Dei sacerdos, panem et vinum offerens fecerat, Ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis et sanguinis repræsentaret.”—*In Matt. c.* 26.

¹⁷³ “Melchisedec, prolato sacramento mensæ Dominicæ, novit æternum ejus sacerdotium figurare.”—*Ep. ad Innocent*, 12, Vol. II. 769. “Sed plane tunc benedictus est

Augustine, then, thought that Melchisedek brought forth the sacrament of the Lord's Table: and that in the bread and wine which he brought was the sacrifice now offered by all Christians.

7. CHRYSOSTOM, who is dated two years later than Augustine, writes:—

“Seeing the type, consider, I pray, the truth also.”¹⁷⁴

8. THEODORET, in the third decade of the fifth century, says:—

“We find Melchisedec to be both priest and king: for he was a type of the true priest and king; and offering unto God not irrational sacrifices, but bread and wine.”¹⁷⁵

9. ARNOBIUS the younger, in the seventh decade of this century, said, that—

“By the mystery of bread and wine Christ was made a priest for ever.”¹⁷⁶

10. CASSIODORUS, in the second decade of the sixth century, says, that—

“The most righteous king instituted the order of Melchisedec by a mystical similitude, when he offered the fruits of bread and wine to the Lord: for it is evident that the victims of cattle have perished, which were of the order of Aaron; and that the institution of Melchisedec rather remains, which is celebrated in all the world in the distribution of the Sacraments.”¹⁷⁷

11. PRIMASIVS, in the middle of this century, wrote, that—

“Christ was made a priest in the order of Melchisedec, not temporal but eternal; nor offering legal victims, but like him, bread and wine, His flesh, namely, and blood.”¹⁷⁸

a Melchisedec—Ibi quippe primum apparuit sacrificium, quod nunc a Christianis offertur Deo toto orbe terrarum.”—De Civ. Dei, xxii. VII. 500. “Noverunt qui legunt, quid protulerit Melchisedec quando benedixit Abraham: et si jam sunt participes ejus, vident tale sacrificium nunc offerri Deo toto orbe terrarum.”—Cont. Adver. Leg. et Proph. I. xx. 39, VIII. 627.

¹⁷⁴ Hom. 35 on Gen. xiv. *ὁρων τὸν τύπον νόει μοι τὴν ἀλήθειαν.*

¹⁷⁵ *Εὐρίσκομεν δὲ τὸν Μελχισεδέκ, καὶ ἱερέα ὄντα καὶ βασιλέα: τύπος γὰρ ἦν τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ ἱερέως καὶ βασιλέως: καὶ προσφέροντα τῷ Θεῷ οὐκ ἔλογα θύματα, ἀλλ' ἄρτους καὶ οἶνον.*—In Psalm 109, p. 852.

¹⁷⁶ “Christus per mysterium panis et vini factus est sacerdos in æternum.”—In Psalm 109.

¹⁷⁷ “Quem ordinem Melchisedec per mysticam similitudinem justissimus rex instituit, quando Domino panis et vini fructus obtulit. Constat enim pecudum victimas periisse, quæ fuerunt ordinis Aaron: et Melchisedec manere potius institutum, quod toto orbe in Sacramentorum erogatione celebratur.”—In Psalm 109.

¹⁷⁸ “In cujus ordine sacerdotii Christus factus est sacerdos, non temporalis, sed æternus; nec offerens victimas legales, sed instar illius panem et vinum, carnem videlicet, et sanguinem suum.”—In Ep. ad Heb. c. 5.

12. JOHANNES DAMASCENUS, at the beginning of the fourth decade of the eighth century, says, that—

“that table [of Melchisedec] shadowed forth this mystical one, as also that priest bore the figure and image of the true High Priest, Christ.”¹⁷⁹

13. ŒCUMENIUS, near the close of the tenth century, said, as cited by Bellarmine, that the words “for ever,” were not written—

“in reference to that sacrifice and oblation only, which was once for all, made by God, looking on to the priests of our time, by whom Christ both sacrifices and is sacrificed, and who delivered to them in that mystical feast and supper, the formula of this priesthood.”¹⁸⁰

The place, however, is properly this : on the words “a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek,” he says: “The expression signifies, that although Christ did not offer an unbloody sacrifice, (since He offered His own body,) yet they who from Him fulfil the priesthood, of whom God vouchsafes to be also High Priest, shall offer without blood: for this ‘for ever,’ signifies. For he would not have said ‘for ever’ of that sacrifice and oblation made by God once for all; but [he writes it] looking to those who now minister, by whose means Christ ministers and is ministered to: Rom. xv. 16: who also in the mystic supper delivered to them the manner of such ministry.”¹⁸¹

The place, with its context, is somewhat obscure: but the writer appears to me distinctly to show, that the bread and wine were not a type of the sacrifice of Christ, or of a sacrifice made by Him, since that of Melchisedek, if it was a sacrifice, was unbloody; but that Christ Himself “did not offer an unbloody sacrifice, since He offered His own body,” and his sacrifice was both bloody and unbloody:¹⁸² and then, that the priesthood for ever was spoken of, not in regard to the

¹⁷⁹ “Mensa illa mysticam hanc adumbrabat, quemadmodum et sacerdos ille veri Pontificis Christi figuram, et imaginem præ se ferebat.”—De Fide, IV. xiv.

¹⁸⁰ ἀφορῶν εἰς τοὺς νῦν ἱεουργοὺς, δι’ ὧν μέσων Χριστὸς ἱεουργεῖ καὶ ἱεουργεῖται, ὁ καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ μυστικῷ δείπνῳ τὸν τρόπον τῆς τοιαύτης ἱεουργίας.—In Ep. ad Heb. c. vi.; Lut. Par. 1631, II. 348.

¹⁸¹ Οὗτος πρῶτος ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν προσήνεγκε τῷ Θεῷ ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον. Δηλοῦντος τοῦ λόγου, ὅτι εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀναίμακτον προσήγαγε θυσίαν (προσήγαγε γὰρ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα), ἀλλ’ οἱ γε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἱερεῖς ὧν Θεὸς καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς ἀξιοὶ εἶναι, ἀναίμακτον προσόισουσι· τοῦτο γὰρ δηλοῖ, τὸ, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. οὐ γὰρ τὴν πρὸς ἀπαξ γενομένην ὑπὸ Θεοῦ θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν εἶπεν ἂν, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλ’ ἐφορῶν εἰς τοὺς νῦν ἱεουργοὺς, δι’ ὧν μέσων Χριστὸς ἱεουργεῖ καὶ ἱεουργεῖται, ὁ καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ μυστικῷ δείπνῳ τὸν τρόπον τῆς τοιαύτης ἱεουργίας.—In Ep. ad Heb. vi.; Lut. Par. 1631, 348.

¹⁸² Εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀναίμακτον προσήγαγε θυσίαν, προσήγαγε γὰρ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα.—Ὁ Χριστὸς ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν προσήνεγκεν, εἶθ’ ὕστερον καὶ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα.

sacrifice (*θυσία*) made once for all by Christ our God, but in regard of the ministry (*ἱερουργία*) which He exercises and with which He is served (*ἱερουργεῖ καὶ ἱερουργεῖται*), by those to whom He has delivered it. He calls that which our Lord offered, *θυσία*; but that which He delivered to the apostles, and which He carries on by their successors, he calls *ἱερουργία*: the former being sacrifice properly; the latter, any sacred or priestly ministration.

It is evident, therefore, that no certain testimony can be extracted from this place of Œcumenius, for the purpose for which it is cited by Bellarmine.

14. THEOPHYLACT, near the end of the eleventh century, says that Christ—

“after the manner of Melchisedec sacrificed with bread and wine.”

And :—

“he said *for ever*, because daily and for ever, by the ministers of God, there is offered an oblation, having Christ the Lord and High Priest, and a sacrifice, who, for our sake, sanctifies, breaks, and gives Himself.”¹⁸³

These fourteen authorities, with four or five others which are not sufficiently to the purpose, are all that Bellarmine has produced to prove that in the opinion of the Fathers, the bread and wine of Melchisedek were a type and figure of the Eucharist. Possibly, a few more might be gleaned: but it is to be presumed that the Cardinal cited all that seemed to him suitable to his purpose. And when these are all, out of about a thousand, or at least, very many hundred¹⁸⁴ writers, from the beginning to the end of the eleventh century; it must be acknowledged that they are very far from proving a *consensus Patrum*, on the subject. They are “few and far between”: one in the second century; one in the third; five in the fourth; two in the fifth; two in the sixth; none in the seventh; one in the eighth; none in the ninth; one in the tenth; and one in the eleventh. And when it is remembered that the first of the Fathers cited, Clemens Alexandrinus, dates from the very end of the second century, it must be seen how very far the typical relation con-

¹⁸³ “In morem illius pane et vino sacrificabat.—In æternum dixit, quia quotidie offertur, in perpetuum offertur per Dei ministros oblatio, Christum Dominum et Pontificem habens, et sacrificium, qui seipsum nostri ob gratiam sanctificat, frangit et tribuit.”—In c. 5 ad Heb. cited from Bellarmine.

¹⁸⁴ Dr. Pusey cites eighty on the subject of the Eucharist in the first five centuries: Bellarmine, nine only here.

tended for by Bellarmine, and after him by Johnson, between the bread and wine of Melchisedek and the Eucharist, is from fulfilling the golden rule, "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus."

Nor can one fail to remark how very scanty is the evidence produced from those two great and very voluminous writers, Augustine and Chrysostom: from the former of whom nothing more could have been produced; while the brief passage from Chrysostom is, in fact, no evidence at all to the point in question, for it does not relate to the alleged sacrifice, or to Melchisedek as offering it.

But a slight analysis and comparison of the places cited will be instructive. First, then, we find three only of these Fathers speaking of Melchisedek himself as a type of Christ: CYPRIAN, who says that he "bore a type of Christ"; THEODORET, who calls him a type of the true priest and king; and JOHANNES DAMASCENUS, who says, that he "bore the figure and image of the true High Priest, Christ." Secondly, with regard to what Melchisedek did, in that he brought forth bread and wine, and blessed Abraham, in six of these recited places his actions are made typical of the actions of Christ: CYPRIAN saying that "Melchisedek—offered bread and wine, that he blessed Abraham"; and that "our Lord Jesus Christ—offered the same," and that his "blessing—belonged to our people;" EUSEBIUS, that "as Melchisedec blessed Abraham with wine only and bread, in the very same manner our Lord and Saviour fulfils His priesthood": JEROME, that "Melchisedec in prefiguration of Christ"—offered "bread and wine": AUGUSTINE, that "Melchisedec in bringing forth a sacrament of the Lord's Table, knew how to figure His eternal priesthood": THEODORET, that "Melchisedec was a type of the true Priest—offering unto God not irrational sacrifices, but bread and wine": and ARNOBIUS, that "by the mystery of bread and wine Christ was made a priest for ever." Thirdly, six of these Fathers speak of the things brought forth by Melchisedek as typical of the Eucharist: CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS calls the "bread and wine—a type of the Eucharist": the PSEUD-AMBROSE, says that "the institution of Melchisedec"—"had the figure of the sacraments," and "is celebrated in all the world in the distribution of the sacraments": JEROME says, that "our mystery is signified in the offered bread and wine": AUGUSTINE says, that in the bread and wine which Melchisedek

brought forth was the "sacrifice now offered to God in all the world": CASSIODORUS says, that "the institution of Melchisedec—is celebrated in all the world in the distribution of the sacraments": and JOHANNES DAMASCENUS says, that the "table of Melchisedec shadowed forth this mystical one." Fourthly, EUSEBIUS says that "Melchisedec does not at all appear to have used corporeal sacrifices, but blessed Abraham with bread and wine." Fifthly, CYPRIAN says, that "in Melchisedec we see the mystery of the sacrifice of the Lord prefigured." Sixthly, two of these Fathers made the offering of Melchisedek identical with the Eucharist; CYPRIAN saying that "Christ offered the same which Melchisedec had offered, that is, bread and wine, namely, His own body and blood"; and PRIMASIUS that "like Melchisedec," Christ offered, not "legal victims, but bread and wine, His flesh, namely, and blood."

So, then, we have only three, out of these fourteen Fathers, finding in Melchisedek a type of Christ: six of them, types of the actions of Christ in the actions of Melchisedek: six of them finding in the bread and wine of Melchisedek types of the elements in the Eucharist: one of them seeing in Melchisedek a prefiguration of our Lord's sacrifice: and two of them not merely making the bread and wine of Melchisedek types of the bread and wine of the Eucharist, but representing them as the very sacrament of the body and blood of Christ: nay, JEROME says, that Melchisedek "dedicated the Christian mystery in the body and blood of the Saviour."

But only two or three, directly or indirectly, speak of the bread and wine of Melchisedek as a sacrifice. CYPRIAN says that "our Lord Jesus Christ—offered a sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the same which Melchisedec had offered." AUGUSTINE says, that they who "are partakers" of that which "Melchisedec brought forth—see such a sacrifice now offered to God in all the world." And THEOPHYLACT says, that our Lord "after the manner of Melchisedec sacrificed with bread and wine." But EUSEBIUS seems opposed to the notion of a sacrifice of bread and wine by Melchisedek; for he says that he "does not at all appear to have used corporeal sacrifices, but blessed Abraham with wine only and bread." The PSEUD-AMBROSE, indeed, speaks of Melchisedek having "offered sacrifice:" but EUSEBIUS, JEROME, THEODORET, CASSIODORUS, and PRIMASIUS, speak in the places cited, not of a sacrifice, but of an offering of the bread and wine by Melchisedek.

Above all, it is to be noticed, that THEOPHYLACT alone, out

of the fourteen, refers to that, at least chief, feature in which Melchisedek was a type of Christ, the continuity and perpetuity of his priesthood: and yet this writer attributes this, not to our Lord Himself, but to his ministers, "because daily and for ever, by the ministers of God, there is offered an oblation having Christ the Lord both High Priest and a sacrifice, who for our sake, sanctifies, breaks, and gives Himself."

On the whole, then, there is next to nothing in these citations from the Fathers, to show that they regarded the bread and wine of Melchisedek as a sacrifice. A very few speak of them as an offering: while some speak of them as neither sacrifice nor offering. But of the majority of them, ten only in number in the course of five centuries, from the end of the second century to the beginning of the eighth, either directly or indirectly make the bread and wine of Melchisedek types of the Eucharist: CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, the PSEUD-AMBROSE, AUGUSTINE, CASSIODORUS, and JOHANNES DAMASCENUS, thus speaking of the bread and wine: CYPRIAN, EUSERIUS, JEROME, AUGUSTINE, THEODORET, and ARNOBIUS, making the action of Melchisedek typical of the action of our Lord: and, consequently, though indirectly, making the bread and wine which Melchisedek brought forth, types of the elements in which our Lord instituted the Eucharist."¹⁸⁵

But the type must be a sacrifice, to prove that the antitype is a sacrifice: and there is no proof that the bread and wine of Melchisedek were a sacrifice. There is nothing in Holy Scripture or in these testimonies of the Fathers which can be made to establish this position. But supposing that the action of Melchisedek was typical, and the things he brought typical; the requirements of the types are fulfilled in the action of our Lord, taking the bread and wine and giving them with blessing

¹⁸⁵ We perceive, however, that "type," as understood by some of these Fathers, had a very indefinite meaning; for immediately before the first place cited from Cyprian, he says: "We find in Genesis also, in respect of the sacrament in Noe, this same thing was to them a precursor and figure of the Lord's passion; that he was made naked in his household; that he was lying down with his thighs naked and exposed; that the nakedness of the father was observed by his second son, and was told abroad, but was covered by two, the eldest and the youngest; and the other matters which it is not necessary to follow out, since this is enough for us to embrace alone, that Noe, setting forth a type of the future truth, did not drink water, but wine, and thus expressed the figure of the passion of the Lord. Invenimus enim in Genesi circa sacramentum Noe hoc idem præcurrisse, et figuram Dominicæ passionis illic extitisse, quod vinum bibit, quod inebriatus est, quod in domo sua nudatus est, quod fuit recubans nudis et patentibus femoribus; quod nuditas illa patris a medio filio denotata est: a majore vero et minore contacta; et cætera quæ non necesse est exsequi, cum satis hoc solum complecti, quod Noe typum futuræ veritatis ostendens, non aquam sed vinum biberit; et sic imaginem Dominicæ passionis expresserit."—Ep. ad Cæcil.

to his disciples. It would, however, be the only case in which the type and antitype are identical: bread and wine typifying bread and wine: a fact which I would submit as destructive of the notion of any such typical relation in the case.

From all that has been said, then, the conclusion is, that there is no proof that Melchisedek offered sacrifice on meeting Abraham: there is no proof that bread and wine were his sacrifice: there is no proof that in bringing forth bread and wine he was a type of Christ: there is no proof from Holy Scripture that the bread and wine brought forth by Melchisedek were a type of the elements in the Eucharist: there is no sufficient proof in the alleged testimonies of the Fathers that the bread and wine of Melchisedek were a sacrifice typifying a sacrifice of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper.

The discussion may, perhaps, seem tedious; but it was not the less necessary: because if Melchisedek offered a sacrifice of bread and wine; and if he was in doing this a type of Christ; it would necessarily follow that our Lord must have offered a like sacrifice; and consequently, that there is a sacrifice of the bread and wine, a material sacrifice, in the Eucharist. But since it cannot be proved that Melchisedek did sacrifice bread and wine, or that in bringing forth these things he was a type of Christ; those conclusions, so far as they depend on the case of Melchisedek, entirely fail.*

V. The last place we have to notice, as alleged in proof of a material sacrifice in the Eucharist, is that in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the apostle says: "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." † And the argument in naked form is this, or at least must be this, in order to prove the conclusion desired: The altar, here spoken of, is a material altar: a material altar must have material sacrifices offered upon it: whatsoever, therefore, is offered on this altar is a material sacrifice: but bread and wine are offered upon it in the Eucharist; and consequently the bread and wine offered upon the altar are a material sacrifice. This is the necessary skeleton of every argument which can be elaborated on this text, however able, ingenious, or learned, by which it can be supposed possible, logically, to prove a material

* See Appendix I I.

† Heb. xiii. 10.

sacrifice in the Eucharist. And when it is represented in few words and due order, it is easy to see how unsound the argument is. For there is nothing to prove that the altar, of which this text speaks, is a material altar.¹⁸⁶ A material altar, in its obvious and proper sense, is an altar fitted for material sacrifices: and material sacrifices offered upon an altar, according to the true definition of material sacrifice, as distinguished from oblations, must be consumed by fire. Hence, a material altar is a structure on which the sacrifice can be so consumed. Under the Old Testament, and in all its writings, an altar, wherever spoken of, always meant a structure of this kind. It was always an altar made of such materials, and so constructed, that, as was required in all kinds of sacrifice but the Passover, sacrifice was consumed upon it by fire.

But under the New Testament, "the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law."* From this change of the law, we have, confessedly, no burnt sacrifices: and, therefore, we require no altars upon which such sacrifices can be made. It is evident that we have no "proper" material altar for sacrifice.

Nor, indeed, is it to be supposed that the advocates of a material sacrifice in the Eucharist would contend that we have an altar of this kind: although a fondness for stone altars might indicate the contrary.

But it is undeniably evident, that if the apostle meant Christians in opposition to Jews, when he said: "We have an altar"; the altar he had in view was not an altar in the Old Testament sense, an altar for material sacrifice.

Thus, then, the first proposition and foundation of the argument, entirely fails; and with it the conclusion necessarily fails also. The altar spoken of is not a material altar for material sacrifice; and therefore material sacrifice cannot be proved from it.

What that altar is, which this place of Holy Scripture tells us we have, is more fitly to be considered in another chapter.

¹⁸⁶ Bellarmine gives up the attempt to prove such an altar from this place. "Some, indeed," he says, "as Haymo, and some other authors of weight, think that the Lord's Table is not improbably called an altar expressly in Heb. xiii.—yet because there are some Catholics, who by altar understand in this place, the cross, or Christ Himself, I do not urge the place itself. Existimant quidem aliqui, ut Haymo; et alii nonnulli graves auctores non improbabiler mensam Domini expresse vocari altare, Heb. 13,—tamen quia non desunt ex Catholicis, qui eo loco per altare intelligant crucem, aut ipsum Christum; non urgeo ipsum locum."—De Missa, I. xiv. Aquinas says: "Per altare autem significatur ipse Christus: de quo dicit Apostolus Heb. ult. 3a, q. 83, 3, 2. Now by the altar, Christ Himself is signified; of whom the Apostle speaks in the last chapter of Hebrews."

* Heb. vii. 12.

The conclusion of the present chapter, which I must consider to have been fully proved by our review of the places of Scripture alleged for a material sacrifice in the Eucharist, is, that that there is no place of Scripture which will prove any such sacrifice.

CHAPTER VII.

THE TEACHING OF THE FATHERS ON THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

THE preceding chapter has shown how little evidence there is in Holy Scripture for the doctrine of a material sacrifice in the Eucharist. It shows that, of the five places alleged in proof of this doctrine, not one supplies such proof.

Still it may be replied, and it is in fact virtually replied, that though it be true that such proof is not to be found in those places according to the interpretation given in the preceding pages, yet the ancient Fathers and the Church, for many ages from the beginning, understood them differently, and taught this doctrine of a material sacrifice. And if this were indeed the fact, if the Fathers and the Church did teach this doctrine, and worship according to it, from the beginning: then it would be certain, either that I have interpreted these places untruly, or else that there are other sufficient proofs, for the establishment of the doctrine, to be drawn from the same divine source. For doctrine and worship, maintained from the very first, must have their foundation and evidence in God's holy word.

But the latter alternative will hardly be pleaded by any. Illustrations may, indeed, be proposed from many other places of Scripture; but such illustrations are of little weight in the failure of proof from the places already examined.

Here, then, we have to enquire, what was the doctrine of the Fathers, and the practice of the Church from the beginning, in reference to this subject. Did the Fathers believe and teach, that we offer a material sacrifice, a sacrifice of the bread and wine, in the Eucharist? and did the Church in the celebration of this Sacrament, make, or profess to make, such sacrifice?

But, first, it must be observed, that it is not sufficient for the purpose of this enquiry, to heap up before the reader a mass of evidence from a number of centuries, and to make it appear to him as if the doctrine of the earliest is identical with the doctrine of the latest, from some shadowy resemblance being

traceable throughout. There must be a strict and careful examination, as we go on, step by step; and the precise doctrine required to be proved, must be distinctly and sufficiently discovered from the very first. This condition will very greatly abridge the enquiry: for if we can find no clear and decisive testimony for a material sacrifice before the end of the second century, we must be convinced that the theory of such a sacrifice, having a later origin, has no sufficient warrant of antiquity to give it a right to a place in the faith of the Church.

1. The first witness cited is CLEMENT OF ROME, who is spoken of by St. Paul, as one of his "fellow labourers, whose names are in the book of life." * He was appointed Bishop of Rome, according to some writers, about the year of our Lord 61, but according to others not till the year 93; according to Johnson and Cave, about 65; and the latter says, that Clement held his bishopric till 81.

Citing Ps. L. 63 according to the Septuagint, "The sacrifice of praise shall glorify me, and there is the way in which I will shew him my salvation," Clement says:—

"This is the way, beloved, in which we have found our salvation, Jesus Christ, the High Priest of our oblations, the patron and defender of our infirmity." 187

In another place, he says:—

"We ought to do all things in order, whatsoever the Lord has commanded us to perform at appointed times. He has commanded both the oblations and liturgies to be celebrated, and that it should be done not in a vain or disorderly manner, but at determined seasons and times. Both where, and by whom He will have them celebrated He Himself has appointed by His most high counsel; that all things that are religiously done according to His good pleasure may be acceptable to His will. They, therefore, who make their oblations at the appointed seasons are both acceptable and happy: for following the ordinances of the Lord they err not. For to the High Priest are given liturgies proper to him, and to the Priests their proper place is ordained, and upon the Levites their proper ministries devolve: the Layman is bound by the ordinances pertaining to the Laymen. Let each of you, brethren, give thanks to God, in his proper order, being in good conscience, not transgressing the appointed rule of His service, in gravity. Not everywhere, brethren, are continual sacrifices offered, either of prayers, free-will offerings [or vows],

* Phil. iv. 3.

¹⁸⁷ "Θυσία αἰνέσεως δοξάζει με, καὶ ἐκεῖ ὁδὸς ἣν δεῖξω αὐτῷ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Αὕτη ἡ ὁδὸς, ἀγαπητοί, ἐν ᾗ εἴρομεν τὸ σωτήριον ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν Ἀρχιερέα τῶν προσφορῶν ἡμῶν."—Ep. ad Corinth. cc. 35, 36.

or sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings, but in Jerusalem alone: and there not in every place is oblation made, but before the sanctuary at the altar, that which is offered having been examined by the High Priest, and the aforesaid ministers. They, therefore, who do anything inconsistent with His will have death for their punishment." 188

And in another place, having shown what care the apostles took to continue a succession of pastors in the Church, he adds:—

“For it will be no small sin for us, if we thrust from the Episcopate those who have unblameably and holily offered the gifts.” 189

Clement, then, taught that Christians have oblations, and that their oblations are made by ministers and by the people, each according to their “proper ordinances” or “appointed rule of service”: that the place, and time, and order of our oblations were appointed by our Lord; and that He is the High Priest through whom both ministers and people offer them. But there is not a word in these places, of any sacrifice offered by Christians, except the “sacrifice of praise.” There is nothing in them of a material sacrifice. Neither is it to be gathered from them what the oblations were, whether material or spiritual; unless it may be inferred from the mention of “gifts” offered by the Bishops, which, from the light of later authorities we may conclude to be alms and oblations of material things presented at the Holy Communion. Nor, again, will these places prove that the portion of the bread and wine which was used for the Communion, were an oblation by themselves. Neither the sacrifice, then, nor the oblation of the elements is to be proved from Clement of Rome.

IGNATIUS, Bishop of Antioch, is said to have conversed with the apostles, and suffered martyrdom at Rome, probably in the

188 “Πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν, ὅσα ὁ Δεσπότης ἐπιτελεῖν ἐκέλευσεν κατὰ καιροῦς τεταγμένους. Τάς τε προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, καὶ οὐκ εἰκῆ ἢ ἀτάκτως ἐκέλευσεν γίνεσθαι, ἀλλ’ ὀρισμένοις καιροῖς καὶ ὥραις. Πού τε καὶ διὰ τίνων ἐπιτελεῖσθαι θέλει, αὐτὸς ὤρισεν τῇ ὑπεράτῃ, αὐτοῦ βουλήσει, ἢ ὁσίως πάντα τὰ γινόμενα ἐν εἰδοκῆσει εὐπρόσδεκτα εἶη τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ. Οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιῶντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν εὐπρόσδεκτοὶ τε καὶ μακάριοι· τοῖς γὰρ νομίμοις τοῦ Δεσπότητος ἀκολουθοῦντες οὐ διαμαρτάνουσιν. Τῷ γὰρ Ἀρχιερεῖ ἰδία λειτουργία δεδομένα εἰσιν, καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τύπος προστέτακται, καὶ λευταῖς ἰδία διακονία ἐπίκεινται· ὁ λαϊκὸς ἀνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται. Ἐκαστος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι εὐχαριστέτω Θεῷ· ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων, μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὀρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα, ἐν σεμνότητι. Οὐ πανταχοῦ, ἀδελφοί, προσφέρονται θυσία ἐνδελιχισμού, ἢ εὐχῶν, ἢ περὶ ἁμαρτίας, καὶ πλημμελίας, ἀλλ’ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ μόνῃ· κἀκεῖ δὲ οὐκ ἐν πάντι τόπῳ προσφέρεται, ἀλλ’ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ναοῦ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, μωμοσκοπηθέν το προσφερόμενον διὰ τοῦ Ἀρχιερέως καὶ τῶν προειρημένων λειτουργῶν. Οἱ οὖν παρὰ τὸ καθῆκον τῆς βουλῆσεως αὐτοῦ ποιούντες τι, θάνατον τὸ πρόστιμον ἔχουσιν.”—Ibid. cc. 40, 41.

189 “Ἄμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται, εἰὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως προσενέγκοντας τὰ δῶρα τῆς Ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλλωμεν.”—Ibid. c. 44.

year 107. In his Epistles written on his way to the imperial city, he says:—

“ Unless one be within the altar he is deprived of the bread of God.”—
 “ Come all of you together as into one temple of God, as to one altar, as to one Jesus Christ.”—“ He that is within the altar is clean : ”—“ Be zealous to use one Eucharist : for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for the union of His blood, one altar, as there is one Bishop.”¹⁹⁰

Thus Ignatius clearly teaches that there is one altar for Christians : but what that altar is, he nowhere says. He does not utter a word from which it might be concluded that he intended a material altar : and the only sacrifices or oblations he alludes to are the sacrifice of Him who on the cross “ offered Himself for us, an oblation and sacrifice to God ” ; and the sacrifice which he asked the Romans to entreat Christ he “ might be found to make of himself by means ” of the lions.*

JUSTIN MARTYR wrote two Apologies † or defences of Christianity, and a Dialogue or Disputation with Trypho, a Jew. They were published at different times, embracing the period probably from the year 140 to 162. He says:—

“ Concerning the sacrifices that in every place are by us Gentiles offered to Him, that is, the bread of the Eucharist and the cup likewise of the Eucharist, He speaks before : ”—“ All those, therefore, who through this name [offer] sacrifices which Jesus Christ commanded to be made, that is at the Eucharist of the bread and of the cup, which [sacrifices] are made in every place of the earth by the Christians, God by anticipation testifies to be well-pleasing to Him. But the [sacrifices] which are made by you and those priests of yours He utterly rejects, saying, ‘ And your sacrifices I will not receive at your hands : for from the rising of the sun until its setting, my name has been glorified,’ He saith, ‘ among the Gentiles.’ But ye profane it, and to this time in your love of strife say, that God does not accept the sacrifices of those called Israelites who then dwelt there, but that He said, that He allows the prayers of those men of that race who at that particular time were dispersed abroad, and calls their prayers sacrifices. That, then, both prayers and thanksgivings offered by those who are worthy, are alone perfect sacrifices and acceptable to God, I myself also say : for these only have Christians received to offer, and

¹⁹⁰ Ἐὰν μὴ τις ἦ ἐντὸς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, ὑστερεῖται τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦ θεοῦ.—Ep. ad Ephes. c. 5.

Πάντες οὖν ὡς εἰς ἓνα ναὸν συνέρχεσθε Θεοῦ, ὡς ἐπὶ ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς ἐπὶ ἓνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.—Ep. ad Magnes. c. 7.

Σπουδάξετε οὖν μὴ εὐχαριστία χρῆσθαι· μὴ γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἐν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἰς ἐπίσκοπος.—Ep. ad Philadelph. c. 4.

* Patres Apostolici. Jacobson, II. 268, 308, 378.

† Cave places them both among the genuine works of Justin.

[that] in the memorial of their food, both dry and liquid, in which a remembrance is made of the sufferings which the Son of God endured." 191

Justin, then, calls the bread and cup of the Eucharist, "the sacrifices which are offered to God in every place by the Gentiles": and if this place stood alone without qualification, it might be applied towards proving a material sacrifice. But Justin is here referring to the prophecy of Malachi, and uses "sacrifices" for the "pure offering" in every place to the name of God: and it is, therefore, clear that he does not use the word in the distinctive sense which the argument requires. And by asserting "that prayers and thanksgivings, offered by those who are worthy, are alone perfect sacrifices and acceptable to God," and that "these only have Christians received to offer"; he refuses to the bread and cup of the Eucharist, by themselves, the name both of the "pure offering" and of sacrifice, and denies that any commandment has been given to offer them as a sacrifice. And inasmuch as Justin says that "in the memorial of our food—a remembrance is made of the sufferings" of Christ; he shows the sense in which he used the word sacrifice of the bread and cup, namely, that by this portion or memorial of our bodily food, both dry and liquid, a commemoration is made of the sacrifice of Christ. The bread and cup were not a perfect and acceptable sacrifice: they were not the "pure offering," for that must needs be perfect and acceptable: they were not the sacrifice which Christians were commanded to offer. The "perfect and acceptable sacrifices which Jesus Christ commanded to be made," are "prayers and thanksgivings—at the Eucharist of the bread and the cup": and "there only."

Such was the opinion of Justin.

191 Περὶ τῶν ἐν παντί τόπῳ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τοιτέστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας, προλέγει, εἰπὼν.—Dial. cum Tryph. c. xli.

Πάντας οὖν, οἱ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτου θυσίας ἄς παρέδωκεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς γίνεσθαι, τοιτέστιν ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, τὰς ἐν παντί τόπῳ τῆς γῆς γινόμενας ὑπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, προλαβὼν ὁ Θεὸς, μαρτυρεῖ εὐαρέστους ὑπάρχειν αὐτῷ· τὰς δὲ ὑφ' ἡμῶν, καὶ δι' ἐκείνων ἡμῶν τῶν ἱερῶν γινόμενας ἀπαναίεται, λέγων, καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἡμῶν οὐ προσδέχομαι ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν· διότι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου ἕως δυσμῶν, τὸ ὄνομα μου δεδοῦσασται, λέγει, ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. ὑμεῖς δὲ βεβηλοῦτε αὐτὸ καὶ μέχρι νῦν φιλονεικοῦντες λέγετε, ὅτι τὰς μὲν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ τότε οἰκούντων Ἰσραηλιτῶν καλουμένων, θυσίας οὐ προσδέχεται ὁ Θεός, τὰς δὲ διὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ τότε δὴ ὄντων ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ἐκείνου ἀνθρώπων εὐχὰς προσίεσθαι αὐτὸν εἰρηκέναι, καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς αὐτῶν θυσίας καλεῖν. "Ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐχαί, καὶ εὐχαρισταί ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι, καὶ εὐαρέστοι εἰσιν τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτὸς φημι· ταῦτα γὰρ μόναι καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν, ξηρὰς τε, καὶ ἰγρὰς, ἐν ἧ' καὶ τοῦ πάθους ὁ πέπονθε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ μέμνηται.—c. xvii.

The description which he gives of the celebration of the Eucharist will be considered in another place. We need only observe here, that there is no trace in it of either the oblation or the sacrifice of the elements.

IRENÆUS, Bishop of Lyons, about the year 185, says :—

“All the Apostles of the Lord are priests, who—always serve the altar :”—“the Word Himself gave to the people a precept of making oblations, although He did not need them, that they might learn to serve God ; so also therefore He wishes us to offer a gift at His altar frequently, without intermission. There is, therefore, an altar in heaven (for thither our prayers and our oblations are directed).”¹⁹²

Again, he says that—

“Giving counsel to His disciples to offer to God first fruits from his creatures, not as though He needs them, but that they themselves may be neither unfaithful nor ungrateful, [our Lord] “took that which is bread of the creature, and gave thanks, saying, ‘This is my body.’ And the cup likewise, which is of that creature, He professed to be His blood, and taught the new oblation of the New Testament, which the Church, receiving it from the Apostles, offers in the whole world to God, even to Him who affords us nourishment, the first fruits of His own gifts in the New Testament.”—“The oblation of the Church, which the Lord has taught to be offered in the whole world, is accounted a pure sacrifice with God, and is accepted by Him : not that He needs a sacrifice from us, but because he who offers is glorified in his offering, if his gift be accepted.”—“We ought, therefore, to offer to God the first fruits of His creature,—and this kind of oblations is not reprobated, for there were oblations there, and there are oblations here : sacrifices among the people, sacrifices also in the Church ; but the species only is changed, inasmuch as they are now offered not by slaves but by sons !”—“Since, therefore, the Church offers with simplicity, its gift is justly accounted a pure sacrifice with God, as Paul says to the Philippian, ‘I am full, having received from Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God’ (iv. 18). For it behoves us to make an oblation to God, and in all things to be found grateful to God our Maker, in a pure mind, and faith without hypocrisy, in firm hope, in fervent love, offering the first fruits of those creatures which are His.—We offer to Him, not as though He needed, but giving thanks for His liberality, and sanctifying the creature : for as God does not need

¹⁹² “Sacerdotes autem sunt omnes Domini Apostoli, qui neque agros, neque domos hæreditant hic, sed semper altari et Deo serviunt.”—Lib. IV. viii. 3.

—“Ipsum verbum dedit populo præceptum faciendarum oblationum, quamvis non indigeret eis, ut discerent Deo servire ; sic et ideo nos offerre vult munus ad altare frequenter, sine intermissione. Est ergo altare in cælis (illuc enim preces nostræ et oblationes nostræ diriguntur) et templum, quemadmodum Johannes in Apocalypsi ait.”—Ibid. xviii. 6.

those things which are from us, so we need to offer something to God; as Solomon says: 'He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord.' For God, who stands in need of nothing, takes our good works to Himself for this purpose, that He may grant us a recompense of His own good things; as our Lord says, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father,—for I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink,' &c.—As, therefore, He does not need these things, yet desires that we should render them for our own benefit, lest we be unfruitful; so the Word gave to the people that very precept as to making oblations, though He needed them not, that they might learn to serve God." ¹⁹³

Thus Irenæus acknowledged an altar which "the Apostles always served," and at which our Lord "wishes us to offer frequently, and without intermission": but this altar, he seems at least to say, is "in heaven," inasmuch as it is thither that "our prayers and oblations are directed."

And the oblations of which he speaks, are the "first fruits" of the creatures offered to God in expression of gratitude to Him. He describes these oblations as offered, when contributions are made for the Ministers of Christ, or for the relief of the needy. And he says that by taking "bread of the first fruits of the creature," and giving thanks, "saying 'This is my body' and the cup likewise," our Lord through his apostles "taught the new oblation of the New Testament," and "the

¹⁹³ "Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi, nec ingrati sint, eum qui ex creatura est panis, accepit, et gratias egit, dicens, 'Hoc est corpus meum.' Et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura, quæ est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est, et Novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem. quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis præstat, primitias suorum munerum in Novo Testamento, de quo in duodecim prophetis Malachias sic præsignificavit."

"Igitur Ecclesie oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, et acceptum est ei: non quod indigeat a nobis sacrificium, sed quoniam is qui offert glorificatur in eo quod offert, si acceptetur munus ejus."—"Offerre igitur oportet Deo primitias ejus creaturæ."—"Et non genus oblationum reprobaturum est, oblationes enim et illic, oblationes autem et hic: sacrificia in populo. sacrificia et in ecclesia, sed species immutata est tantum, quippe cum jam non a servis, sed a filiis offerantur."

"Quoniam igitur cum simplicitate offert Ecclesia, juste munus ejus purum sacrificium apud Deum deputatum est, quemadmodum et Paulus Philippiensibus ait (iv. 18)—Oportet enim nos oblationem Deo facere, et in omnibus gratos inveniri fabricatori Deo, in sententia pura, et fide sine hypocrisi, in spe firma, in delectatione ferventi, primitias earum, quæ sunt ejus, creaturarum offerentes. Hanc oblationem Ecclesia sola puram offert fabricatori, offerens ei cum gratiarum actione ex creatura ejus."

"Offerimus autem ei, non quasi indigenti; sed gratias agentes Donationi [vel Dominationi] ejus, et sanctificantes creaturam: quemadmodum enim Deus non indiget eorum quæ a nobis sunt, sic nos indigemus offerre aliquid Deo, sicut Solomon ait. 'Qui miseretur pauperi, fenerator Deo.' Qui enim nullius indigens est Deus, in se assumit bonas operationes nostras, ad hoc ut præstet nobis retributionem bonorum suorum; sicut Dominus noster ait, Mat. xxv. 34, &c. Sicut igitur non his indigens, attamen a nobis propter nos fieri vult, ne simus infructuosi; ita id ipsum verbum dedit populo præceptum faciendarum oblationum," &c.—IV. xvii. 3; xviii. 1, 2, 4, 6.

Church," therefore, "in the whole world, offers to Him who gives food to us, the first fruits of His gifts." But there is nothing in these places to show that Irenæus regarded the bread and wine in the Eucharist as a sacrifice, or even as an oblation by themselves, as the elements for that Sacrament. It would seem, according to him, that an oblation of first fruits was offered in thankfulness to God for his blessings, and that out of those first fruits a portion was taken for the Eucharist; and there is nothing to show a further oblation of them.

TERTULLIAN flourished in the end of the second and beginning of the third century. He says:—

"Let us not go up to the altar of God before we make up any difference or offence we have incurred with our brethren."—"No one who is at variance with his brother will finish the offering of his gift at the altar, unless first by being reconciled to his brother, he have come back to patience."

He says also that women have no cause to go out in public, except when

"some sick person among the brethren is to be visited; or sacrifice is offered, or the Word of God dispensed."—"On the station days most think they ought not to be present at the prayers of the sacrifices, because the station must be broken [or dissolved] by receiving the Lord's body. Does the Eucharist, then, dispense with the obedience devoted to God? or bind it more to God? Will not your station be more solemn if you have stood at the altar of God? When the body of the Lord has been received and reserved, both is secured, the participation of the sacrifice, and the fulfilment of duty."—"We have shown that the sacrifices of earthly oblations and of spiritual sacrifices were foretold."—"We sacrifice for the health of the Emperor, but to our God and his, but in the way which God has commanded by pure prayer."¹⁹⁴

¹⁹⁴ "Ne prius ascendamus ad Dei altare, quam si quid discordiæ vel offensæ cum fratribus contraxerimus, resolvamus."—De Orat. c. 10.

"Nemo convulsus animum in fratrem suum, munus apud altare perficiet, nisi prius reconciliando fratri reversus ad patientiam fuerit."—De Pat. c. 12.

"Vobis autem nulla procedendi causa non tetrica; aut imbecillus aliquis e fratribus visitandus, aut sacrificium offertur, aut Dei sermo administratur."—De Cult. Fœm. II. xi.

"Stationum diebus, non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit accepto corpore Domini: ergo devotum Deo obsequium eucharistia resolvit? an magis Deo obligat? Nonne solemnior erit statio tua, si ad aram Dei steteris? Accepto corpore Domini, et reservato, utrumque salvum est, et participatio sacrificii, et executio officii."—De Orat. c. 14.

"Sacrificia terrenarum oblationum, et spiritualium sacrificiorum prædicta ostendimus."—Adv. Jud. c. 5.

"Sacrificamus pro salute imperatoris, sed Deo nostro et ipsius, sed quo modo præcepit Deus, pura prece."—Ad Scapulam, c. 2.

So Tertullian speaks of an altar, which, for aught he says, may be either material or spiritual, an altar on earth or the altar in heaven, to which Irenæus shows that "our oblations and prayers are directed." He speaks also of "sacrifice," but does not say what it is: and he speaks of "sacrifices of earthly oblations and of spiritual sacrifices," "partaking of the sacrifice" of "the Lord's body," and of sacrifice for the health of the Emperor; which last, by Divine commandment, is "by pure prayer." But he speaks nothing of a sacrifice of the bread and wine of the Eucharist, nor even of the oblation of the elements for this Sacrament.

And now to recount briefly the sum of these testimonies.

Ignatius, Irenæus, and Tertullian acknowledge an altar: but it does not clearly appear in what sense, or what kind of altar. Clement speaks of gifts, and of oblations. Irenæus speaks of oblations of first fruits. But neither Clement nor Irenæus speaks of oblations of the elements by themselves. And Tertullian speaks of sacrifice, but says nothing of a sacrifice of the bread and wine specially for, or in, the Holy Communion.

Volumes of extracts like these would fail to prove that these early Fathers deemed that there is any material sacrifice in the Eucharist: or that they considered such a sacrifice deducible from Scripture.

Tertullian carries us some way into the third century: and if we were to extend the enquiry, it would be found that a very considerable time passed, before any distinct intimations or declarations were given of a belief, that there was a material sacrifice in the Lord's Supper.

But there is some very important evidence of a negative character to be considered.

It has been seen how Justin Martyr declares that "prayers and thanksgivings, offered by those who are worthy, are alone perfect sacrifices and acceptable to God," and that "these only have Christians received to offer": in which words he implicitly refuses to the bread and cup of the Eucharist, by themselves, the name both of the "pure offering" and of sacrifice, and expressly denies that any commandment has been given to offer them as a sacrifice. It has been seen also, how Tertullian asserted that the way in which God has commanded us to sacrifice, is "by pure prayer."

There is an epistle attributed to St. Barnabas, which, if written by him, would be dated about the year 71, or shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, but at all events, whoever was its author, was written before the middle of the second century. It says:—

“We ought to give heed to ourselves and diligently enquire into the ordinances of the Lord.—For He hath revealed to us by all the prophets, that He needs neither sacrifices, nor burnt-offerings, nor oblations, saying thus, ‘What is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. I am full of burnt-offerings, and desire not the fat of lambs, not even when ye come to appear before me: for who hath required this at your hands? Tread no more my courts, though ye bring fine flour. Incense is a vain abomination unto me; your new moons and sabbaths and high day I will not endure.’ He has, therefore, abolished these things, that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is without the yoke of necessity, might have a human oblation.”¹⁹⁵

Athenagoras, about the year 170, in his Legation or Apology for the Christians, replying to the charge of atheism, and explaining “why the Christians do not offer sacrifices,” says:—

“As to our not sacrificing; the Framer and Father of this universe does not need blood nor the odour of burnt-offerings, nor the fragrance of flowers and incense, forasmuch as He is Himself perfect fragrance, needing nothing either within or without: but the greatest sacrifice to Him is for us to know” His works.—“When holding God to be this Framer of all things, who preserves them in being and superintends them,—we ‘lift up holy hands’ to Him, what more magnificent sacrifice does He yet want?—And what have I to do with holocausts, which God does not need? though we ought to offer an unbloody sacrifice, and ‘the reasonable service.’” * 196

¹⁹⁵ “Debemus adtententes inquirere æquitates Domini.—Adaperuit enim nobis per omnes prophetas, quia non utitur nostris hostiis, neque victimis, neque oblationibus, dicens: ‘Quo mihi multitudinem sacrificiorum vestrorum, dicit Dominus: Plenus sum holocaustomatibus arietum, et pinguaminibus agnorum: et sanguinem hircorum, et taurorum nolo. Nec si veniatis videri mihi: quis enim exquisivit hæc de manibus vestris? Calcare aulam meam non adjicietis. Si attuleritis mihi similaginem, vanum; supplicamentum execratio mihi est. Neomenias vestras, et diem magnum non sustineo; jejuniun, et ferias, et dies festos odit anima mea.’ Hæc ergo vacua fecit, ut nova lex Domini nostri Jesu Christi, quæ sine jugo necessitatis est, humanam habeat oblationem.”—C. 1, vel 2.

* Rom. xii. 1.

¹⁹⁶ Ὁ τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργὸς καὶ πατὴρ, οὐ δεῖται αἵματος, οὐδὲ κνίσσης, οὐδὲ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ θυμαμάτων εὐωδίας, αὐτὸς ἂν ἢ τελεία εὐωδία, ἀνευδής καὶ ἀπροσδεής (indigens et extra se desiderans) ἀλλὰ θυσία αὐτῷ μεγίστη, ἂν γινώσκωμεν τίς ἐξέτεινε καὶ συνεσφαίρωσε τοὺς οὐρανοὺς.—ὅταν ἔχοντες τὸν δημιουργὸν θεὸν, συνέχοντα καὶ ἐποπτεύοντα ἐπιστήμη καὶ τέχνῃ καθ’ ἣν ἄγει τὰ πάντα, ἐπαίρωμεν ὀσίους χεῖρας αὐτῷ, ποίας ἔτι χρεῖαν ἐκατόμβης ἔχει;—τί δέ μοι ὀλοκαυτώσεων ἂν μὴ δεῖται ὁ θεὸς; καὶ τοὶ προσφέρειν θεὸν ἀναιμακτον θυσίαν, καὶ τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν.—Athenag. XII. Oxon. 1706, pp. 48, 49.

Irenæus says :—

“It was not because He was angry, like a man, as many venture to say, that He rejected their sacrifices; but out of compassion to their blindness, and with the view of suggesting to them the true sacrifice, by offering which they shall appease God, that they may receive life from Him. As He elsewhere declares: ‘The sacrifice of God is an afflicted heart: a sweet savour to God is a heart glorifying Him who formed it.’ For if, when angry, He had repudiated these sacrifices of theirs, as if they were persons unworthy to obtain His compassion, He would not certainly have urged these same things upon them as those by which they might be saved. But inasmuch as God is merciful, He did not cut them off from good counsel. For after He had said by Jeremiah, ‘To what purpose bring ye me incense from Saba, and cinnamon from a far country? Your whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices are not acceptable to me;’ He proceeds: ‘Hear the Word of the Lord, all Judah. These things saith the Lord,—the God of Israel, make straight your ways and your doings, and I will establish you in this place.’”¹⁹⁷

Tertullian says :—

“I offer to Him a rich and a greater sacrifice which He Himself has commanded; prayer proceeding from a chaste body, from an innocent soul, from a sanctified spirit: not a farthing’s worth of frankincense, tears of an Arabian tree, not two drops of wine.¹⁹⁸—That we ought not to offer unto God earthly, but spiritual sacrifices, we so read as it is written: ‘the sacrifice of God is a troubled and humbled heart;’ and in another place: ‘Offer unto God thanksgiving, and pay thy vows unto the Most High.’ So, therefore, the spiritual sacrifices of praise are designated, and a troubled heart is demonstrated to be an acceptable sacrifice to God.”¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁷ “Non enim sicut homo iratus, et multi audent dicere, divertit eorum sacrificium; sed miserans eorum cæcitati, et verum sacrificium insinuans, quod offerentes propitiabuntur Deum, ut ab eo vitam percipiant. Quemadmodum alibi ait: ‘Sacrificium Deo cor contribulatum; odor suavitatis Deo, cor clarificans eum qui psalnavit.’ Sic enim irascens abnuerat hæc cæcorum sacrificia, tanquam qui indigni essent consequi misericordiam ejus, non utique eisdem ipsis suaderet, per quæ salvari possent. Sed quoniam Deus misericors est, non abscidit eos a bono consilio. Nam per Hierimiam cum dixisset, ‘Quo mihi thus de Saba affertis, et cinnamomum de terra longinqua? holoocaustata et sacrificia vestra non delectaverunt me;’ intulit, ‘Audite sermonem Domini, omnis Juda. Hæc dicit Dominus Deus Israel: Dirigite vias vestras et studia vestra, et constituam vos in loco isto.’—IV. (ed Grabe) c. 31, pp. 321, 322, al. Contr. Hæc. IV. xvii. 2.

¹⁹⁸ “Offero ei opimam et majorem hostiam, quam Ipse mandavit; orationem de carne pudica, de anima innocenti, de spiritu sancto profectam; non grana thuris unius assis, Arabice arboris lacrymas, nec duo meri guttas.”—Apol. 30.

Waterland observes, “that if Tertullian had understood the material elements of the Eucharist to be a sacrifice, how easy it might have been to retort upon him the worthless grains of wheat, and the like.”—Review, xii. Works, vii. 367.

¹⁹⁹ “Namque, quod non terrenis sacrificiis, sed spiritalibus, Deo litandum sit, ita legitur ut scriptum est: ‘Cor contribulatum et humiliatum hostia Deo est.’ Et alibi, ‘Sacrifica Deo sacrificia laudis, et redde Altissimo vota tua.’ Sic igitur sacrificia spiritalia laudis designantur, et cor contribulatum acceptabile sacrificium Deo demonstratur.”—Adv. Jud. V.

Minucius Felix says:—

‘A good soul and a pure mind, and a sincere conscience is a propitiatory sacrifice. Therefore, he who cultivates innocence supplicates the Lord; he who does justice offers a libation to God; he who keeps from fraud propitiates God; he who snatches a man from danger slays a fat victim. These are our sacrifices, these are the holy things of God.’²⁰⁰

Clement of Alexandria says:—

“The altar that is with us here, the terrestrial one, is the assembly of those who devote themselves to the prayers, having, as it were their one common voice and one mind.—They will not believe us when we say, that the righteous soul is truly a holy altar; and that the holy prayer [we make] is the incense [rising] from it.—Therefore, and with reason too, we do not sacrifice to Him who is not overcome by pleasures.—We rightly do not sacrifice to God who needeth nothing, who supplies all with all things: but we glorify Him who was sacrificed for us by sacrificing ourselves.—If, by nature, being in need of nothing, He delights when He is honoured, we not unreasonably honour God by prayer: and this, the best and holiest sacrifice, we send up to the most righteous Word, offering it in His honour with righteousness.—His [the true Gnostic, or the Christian’s,] sacrifices are prayers, praises, and readings in the Scriptures before the feast, and psalms and hymns during meals and before bed, and prayers also again during night.—The sacrifice of the Church is a word rising as incense from the holy souls, the sacrifice and the whole purpose being together opened to God.”²⁰¹

Origen, when it was objected to Christians, that they had no altars, replied that Celsus thus objected:—

²⁰⁰ “Putatis autem nos occultare quod colimus, si delubra et aras non habemus? Quod enim simulacrum Deo fingam, cum si recte existimes, sit Dei homo ipse simulacrum? templum quod ei extruam, cum totus hic mundus, ejus opere fabricatus, eum capere non possit? et cum homo latius maneam, intra unam ædiculam vim tantæ majestatis includam? Nonne melius in nostra dedicandum est mente? in nostro imo consecrandus est pectore? Hostias et victimas Domino offeram, quas in usum mei protulit, ut rejiciam ei suum munus? Ingratum est: cum sit litabilis hostia bonus animus, et pura mens, et sincera conscientia. Igitur, qui innocentiam colit, Domino supplicat; qui justitiam, Deo libat; qui fraudibus abstinet, propitiat Deum; qui hominem periculo subripit, opimam victimam cædit. Hæc nostra sacrificia, hæc Dei sacra sunt.”—Sect. 23, pp. 213, 214. Lugd. Batav. 1672 (p. 352).

²⁰¹ “Ἔστι γοῦν τὸ παρ’ ἡμῖν θυσιαστήριον ἐνταῦθα τὸ ἐπίγειον, τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ταῖς εὐχαῖς ἀνακειμένων, μίαν ὡσπερ ἔχον φωνὴν τὴν κοινὴν καὶ μίαν γνώμην.—Strom. VII. vi. p. 717; Lut. Par. 1641. Βωμῶν δὲ ἀληθῶς ἅγιον, τὴν δικαίαν ψυχὴν· καὶ τὸ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς θυμίαμα, τὴν δόξαν εὐχὴν λέγουσιν ἡμῖν ἀπιστήσουσιν.—Ibid. Εἰκότως ἄρα τῷ μὴ νικαμένῳ ἥδοναὶς θυσίαν οὐ προσάγομεν.—VII. iii. p. 707. Οὐ θύομεν εἰκότως ἀνευθεῖ τῷ θεῷ, τῷ τὰ πάντα τοῖς πᾶσι παρεσχημένῳ· τὸν δὲ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἱερευθέντα δοξάζομεν, σφᾶς οὕτους ἱερεύοντες.—Εἰ δὲ τιμωμένον χαίρει, φύσει ἀνευθεῖς ὑπάρχων, οὐκ ἀπεικότως ἡμεῖς δι’ εὐχῆς τιμῶμεν τὸν Θεόν· καὶ ταύτην τὴν θυσίαν ἀρίστην καὶ ἀγιωτάτην μετὰ δικαιοσύνης ἀναπέμπομεν τῷ δικαιοτάτῳ λόγῳ γεραίροντες.—δι’ οὐ παραλαμβάνομεν τὴν γνώσιν, διὰ τούτου δοξάζοντες ἃ μεμαθήκαμεν.—VII. vi. p. 717. Αὐτίκα θυσίαι μὲν αὐτῷ εὐχαῖ τε καὶ αἶνοι, καὶ αἱ πρὸ τῆς ἐστιάζσεως ἐντεύξεις τῶν γραφῶν· ψαλμοὶ δὲ καὶ ὕμνοι παρὰ τὴν ἐστίασιν, πρὸ τῆς κοίτης· ἀλλὰ καὶ νύκτωρ εὐχαὶ πάλιν.—VII. vii. p. 728.

Καὶ γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ θυσία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, λόγος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ψυχῶν ἀναθυμιάμενος, ἐκκαλυπτομένης ἅμα τῆς θυσίας καὶ τῆς διανοίας ἀπάσης τῷ Θεῷ.—VII. vi. p. 717.

“not seeing that we have for altars the mind of each one of the righteous, from which truly and mentally are sent up sweet smelling sacrifices [namely] the prayers [that come] from a pure conscience.”²⁰²

Of these Fathers, then, extending some way into the third century, Clement of Alexandria and Origen tell us, that the Christian altar is “the mind of each one of the righteous,” or “the righteous soul”: and Clement says also, it is “the assembly of those who devote themselves to the prayers.” Barnabas says that God has abolished “burnt offerings,” oblations of “the fat of lambs,” and of “fine flour” and “incense.” Athenagoras acknowledges that “Christians do not offer sacrifices.” Tertullian says “that we ought not to offer earthly, but spiritual sacrifices,” as the sacrifice of “a troubled and humbled heart,” of “thanksgiving” and “praise.” And with this all the others agree; for when Athenagoras says that “Christians do not offer sacrifices,” he means earthly or material sacrifices. Barnabas declares “a human oblation,” by which we must understand, as I suppose, the Christian’s own self. Athenagoras says that “to know the works of God is the greatest sacrifice”; that there is no “more magnificent sacrifice” than the lifting up “of holy hands”; and that our sacrifice is “an unbloody sacrifice,” and the present of the “reasonable service” of our “bodies, a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God” (Rom. xii. 1). Irenæus tells us that God, having rejected all the sacrifices of the Jews, teaches “the true sacrifice” to “appease God,” “the sacrifice of an afflicted heart”: and that, instead of “incense” and “cinnamon,” of “whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices,” the sacrifice He required is to “hear the word of the Lord,” and to “make straight their ways and their doings.” So Minucius Felix teaches, that “a good soul, and a pure mind, and a sincere conscience is a propitiatory sacrifice”: and that the sacrifices of “Christians,” “the holy things of God,” are innocence, justice, honesty, and charity: and that he who does these things, “slays a fat victim.” Tertullian teaches that “prayer from a chaste body, from an innocent soul, from a sanctified spirit,” is “a rich sacrifice,” and greater than any of the Jewish sacrifices: that this is “the sacrifice which God has commanded”: and that the sacrifices we ought to offer are the sacrifice of a troubled heart, the oblation of “thanksgiving,” and the “spiritual

²⁰² “Ὀὐχ ὁρῶν ὅτι βωμοὶ μὲν εἰσὶν ἡμῖν τὸ ἐκάστου τῶν δικαίων ἡγεμονικὸν ἀφ’ οὗ ἀναπέμπεται ἀληθῶς καὶ νοητῶς εὐώδη θυμιάματα, αἱ προσευχαὶ ἀπὸ συνεδήσεως καθαρᾶς.”—Cont. Cel. viii. Cantab. 1677, 389.

sacrifices of praise." Clement of Alexandria says that "prayer in righteousness" is "the best and holiest sacrifice"; and that "the Christian's sacrifices are prayers, praises, and reading of the Scriptures, psalms and hymns": language "rising from holy souls." And Origen says that "prayers from a pure conscience" are "sweet smelling sacrifices."

But, in addition to such testimonies, it is to be remembered, that the early Christians were frequently charged, especially by the philosophers, with atheism, because they had no temples, nor altars, nor sacrifices: and that while they repudiated the charge of atheism, and claimed to be true theists, the only true believers in God, and the only worshippers of Him according to his will and attributes, they not only admitted that they had neither altars nor sacrifices, such as Jews and Gentiles had, but gloried in the fact, and asserted that for altars they had men's hearts; and for sacrifices, they had in prayers and thanksgivings, in divine knowledge, in all good works, in the sacrifice of themselves, oblations greater, better, and more acceptable to God than all the sacrifices which Jew or heathen could offer. They had no idea of such a reply to their accusers as they would make, who profess a material sacrifice in the Eucharist. Those eminent Fathers, who wrote "Apologies" for the Christians, had no thought of pleading that they had earthly altars and sacrifices as well as all other men had.

And now this part of the enquiry may be very fitly closed with the following passage from St. Chrysostom. Referring to the prophecy of Malachi, he says:—

"See with what light and clearness he interpreted the mystic table, the bloodless oblation (*θυσία*).²⁰³ And pure incense (*θυμίαμα*), he calls the holy prayer which is carried up in the oblation. For that incense appeases God [namely], not that which is taken from the earthly roots, but the incense which ascends from a pure heart. 'Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense.'* Seest thou how it is committed to the angelic liturgy to impart full light? Seest thou how neither the altar nor the hymn has been defined? 'In every place incense is

²⁰³ In the passage here cited from St. Chrysostom, he uses the three words *θύνα*, *θυσία*, and *θυμίαμα*, apparently as synonymous, but not really or intentionally so: for on a careful examination it will be found, I think, that he uses them with a clear etymological distinction: 1. *θύνα* for the victim or thing offered; which is the sense in which it is found in the Septuagint, in the few places where it occurs (2 Kings vi. 13; Exod. xxix. 28; xxxiv. 25; 2 Chron. vii. 4; Prov. xvii. 1; Ezek. xl. 42; xlv. 25; Gen. xliii. 16; Prov. ix. 2; 1 Kings xxv. 11); 2. *θυσία* for the immolation or oblation of the victim, presentation of the offering, or the rite or act of oblation; though he uses it also for the victim: and 3. *θυμίαμα* for incense, or the sweet savour arising from the immolated victim as it burns on the altar.

* Ps. cxli. 2.

offered to my name.' There is, therefore, a pure oblation (*θυσία*); first, the mystic table, the heavenly, the supramundane victim (*θῦμα*). And there is also among us a difference of many oblations. For since the law had many oblations in the Old Testament,—the New Grace on its coming embraced all in one, and set up one true oblation. And we have also among ourselves other oblations not ruled by the law, but befitting the angelic grace. And wilt thou learn these oblations which the Church has? how without blood and smoke, and altar, and the rest, the evangelical gift ascends to God, and the oblation pure and undefiled? Hear the Holy Scripture clearly shewing you the difference of this and the variety.

There is, then, the first oblation, that rational and mystical gift, of which Paul says, 'Be ye followers of God, as dear children, and walk in love, as Christ also loved us, and gave Himself for us, an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.' A second oblation is that of the martyrs, and what word testifies? Hear Paul: 'I beseech you, brethren, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God.' For a first thou hast the oblation of salvation; a second, that of the martyrs; a third, that of prayer; a fourth that by praise, that is, by hymns. 'Offer unto God the sacrifice of praise:' a fifth, that by righteousness: 'then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifice of righteousness': a sixth, that by alms: 'an oblation,' he says, 'pure and undefiled, is to visit the poor and orphans in their affliction.' A seventh, that of the shout of victory:—'for the prophet calls them blessed who were to know the victory of Christ, as they sing their hymns against their enemies.* An eighth, is another oblation to God, a broken spirit: 'a broken and humbled heart God will not despise.' Seest thou how great oblations are in use with us? There is also another new oblation, which is accomplished by the preaching of the Gospel, the word of doctrine of which the Apostle Paul says: 'Ministering the Gospel of God that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.' Seest thou how he shewed that preaching also ascends to God for oblation? Thou hast, then, as first oblation, the saving gift: second, the oblation of the martyrs: third, that of prayer: fourth, that of the shout of victory: fifth, that of righteousness: sixth, that of alms: seventh, that of praise: eighth, that of contrition: ninth, that of humble-mindedness: tenth, that of preaching. Though I have omitted something: for having reckoned up nine, I thought I had given ten. What, then, is the oblation that was overlooked? The tenth, therefore, has that of bearing fruit, of which Paul says: 'I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God.' † Thou hast, then, varieties of oblations." 204

* Ps. lxxxviii. 15; John xvi. 33; Ps. xxvi. 6.

† Phil. iv. 18.

²⁰¹ Commenting on Mal. i. 11, he says: "Ορα πῶς λαμπρῶς καὶ περιφανῶς τὴν μυστικὴν ἠρμένευσε τράπεζαν, τὴν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν. θυμίαμα δὲ λέγει καθαρὸν τὴν προσευχὴν τὴν ἁγίαν τὴν μετὰ τῆς θυσίας ἀναφωμένην. ἐκεῖνο γὰρ Θεὸν ἀναπαύει τὸ θυμίαμα, οὐ τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν ῥιζῶν γῆινων λαμβανόμενον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀπὸ καθαρῆς καρδίας ἀναπεμπόμενον θυμίαμα. κατευθυνθῆτω ἡ προσευχή μου ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιόν σου. ὄρᾳς ὅπως πανταχοῦ διαλάμπει ἐπιτρέπεται τῇ λειτουργίᾳ ἀγγελικῇ; ὄρᾳς ὅπως οὐ περιώρισται οὔτε τὸ θυσιαστήριον, οὔτε

According to this place of Chrysostom, then, there is a mystic altar and a bloodless oblation, in fulfilment of the prophecy in Malachi; the incense there spoken of being the holy prayer which is carried up in ²⁰⁵ the oblation. This he explains by a reference to “the angelic liturgy,” which throws full light upon the prophecy. There is neither altar nor hymn prescribed for the oblation of the pure incense. But there is, first, “the mystic table, the heavenly, the supramundane victim” (θύμα). He does not say altar, a thing or structure on which sacrifice is offered to God; but he says table, a thing on which a sacrifice has been offered to Him is presented and communicated to man. And the sacrifice which has been offered to God, and is presented to man, is “the celestial and supramundane victim,” not the earthly elements by which that victim is

τὸ ἄσμα; ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ θυμίαμα προσφέρεται τῷ ὀνοματί μου. ἔστι μὲν οὖν θυσία καθαρά, πρώτη μὲν ἢ μυστικὴ τράπεζα, τὸ οὐράνιον, τὸ ὑπερκόσμιον θύμα. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν διάφορα πολλῶν θυσιῶν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὁ νόμος εἶχε πολλὰς θυσίας ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ, καὶ τὴν μὲν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, τὴν δὲ ὀλοκαύτωμα λεγομένην.—καὶ τὴν μὲν αἰνέσεως, τὴν δὲ σωτηρίου, ἄλλην ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαυμένων λεπτῶν, καὶ ἄλλας πολλὰς καὶ διαφόρους ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν μυρίοις μίσμασιν ἔξεταζομένων· καὶ πολλὸς ἦν καὶ ἄμετρος ἀριθμὸς θυσιῶν τῶν κατὰ νόμον, ἢ νέα χάρις ἐλθοῦσα διὰ μιᾶς περιγράφει πάσας, καὶ μίαν ἀληθινὴν ἔστησε θυσίαν. ἔχομεν δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑτέρας θυσίας, οὐ τῷ νόμῳ στοιχοῦσας, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀγγελικῇ χάριτι προεούσας. καὶ βούληθε μαθεῖν τὰς θυσίας ταύτας. ἅς ἔχει ἡ ἐκκλησία, πῶς ἐκτὸς αἰμάτων καὶ καπνοῦ, καὶ βωμοῦ, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν δῶρον ἀναπέμπεται τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἡ θυσία καθαρά καὶ ἁμιάνοτος; ἀκούε τῆς ἁγίας γραφῆς σαφῶς τοι παριστάσης τὴν διαφορὰν ταύτης, καὶ τὴν ποικιλίαν. ἔστιν οὖν ἡ πρώτη θυσία, ἣν ἔφθον εἰπὼν, τὸ νοερόν ἐκεῖνο καὶ μυστικὸν δῶρον, περὶ οὗ φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος, μμηταὶ γίνεσθε τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπητὰ, καὶ περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν εἰς ὄσμὴν εὐωδίας. δευτέρα θυσία, ἡ τῶν μαρτύρων. καὶ τίς μαρτυρεῖ λόγος; ἀκούε Παύλου παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζώσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ. ἔχεις πρώτῃν σωτηρίας τὴν θυσίαν, δευτέραν τὴν τῶν μαρτύρων, τρίτην τὴν τῆς εὐχῆς. κατευνθίτω ἡ προσευχή μου, ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιόν σου. ἔπαιρσις τῶν χειρῶν μου, θυσία ἐσπερινή. τετάρτη ἡ δι' αἰνέσεως, τούτῳ, δι' ὕμνων. θίσον τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως. πέμπτη ἡ διὰ δικαιοσύνης. τότε εὐδοκῆσεις θυσίαν δικαιοσύνης. ἕκτη ἡ δι' ἐλεημοσύνης· θυσία, φησὶ, καθαρά καὶ ἁμιάνοτος, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι πτωχοῖς καὶ ὀρφανοῖς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίσει αὐτῶν. ἑβδόμη ἡ τοῦ ἀλαλαγμοῦ. ἀλαλαγμὸς δὲ ἔστιν ἐπινίκιος ἐν πολέμῳ κρότος. ἄλλο γὰρ ὀλολυγμὸς, καὶ ἄλλο ἀλαλαγμὸς. ὅταν γὰρ μετὰ νίκης ἐν πολέμῳ στρατιῶται βοῶσιν, ἀλαλαγμὸς ἔστιν ἐκεῖνος, καὶ σήμερον νίκης. διὰ τοῦτο ὁ προφήτης τοὺς μέλλοντας εἰδέναι τὴν νίκην τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸν ὕμνον βῶντας τὸν κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων, μακαρίζει λέγων (Ps. lxxxviii. 15; Joan. xvi. 33; Ps. xxxi. 6):—ὀδὸν ἔστιν ἑτέρα θυσία τῷ Θεῷ, πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον, καρδίαν συντετριμμένην καὶ τεταπεινωμένην ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἐξουδενώσει. ὄρᾳς πηλίκαι θυσίαι παρ' ἡμῖν πολιτεῖονται; ἔστι καὶ ἄλλη καινὴ θυσία ἡ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελικοῦ κηρύγματος πληρουμένη, ὁ λόγος ὁ διδασκτικὸς, περὶ οὗ φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος (Rom. xv. 16).—Ἱεροουργούντες—ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. ὄρᾳς ὅπως εἰδείξεν, ὅτι καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα ἀπὸ θυσίας ἀναπέμπεται τῷ Θεῷ; ἔχεις οὖν πρώτῃν θυσίαν, τὸ σωτήριον δῶρον· δευτέραν, τὴν τῶν μαρτύρων· τρίτην, τὴν τῆς προσευχῆς. τετάρτην, τὴν τοῦ ἀλαλαγμοῦ· πέμπτην, τὴν τῆς δικαιοσύνης· ἕκτην τὴν τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης· ἑβδόμην, τὴν τῆς αἰνέσεως· ὀδὸν, τὴν τῆς κατανύξεως· ἑνάτην, τὴν τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης· δεκάτην, τὴν τοῦ κηρύγματος· εἰ καὶ τι παρέλιπον. ἐννεὰ γὰρ ἀπαριθμηθέντες, ἐνόμισα δέκα παραδίδουσαι. τίς οὖν ἡ παραλειμμένη θυσία; ἔστι τοῖνυν δεκάτη ἡ τῆς καρποφορίας, περὶ οὗ ὁ Παῦλος φησὶν (Phil. iv. 18).—ἔχεις οὖν ποικιλίαν θυμάτων.—1032, 2.

²⁰⁵ μετὰ τῆς θυσίας, I translate “in the oblation”: because, taking, as I think we must take, θυσίας for the offering or burning of the incense, by which is signified the utterance of the prayer, it is in the utterance of the prayer, in the burning of the incense, that the pure offering ascends.

signified. In this "one true sacrifice," Chrysostom says "the New Grace—has embraced all" the "many sacrifices" of "the law." But as "befitting the angelic grace," "the one true sacrifice," "we have also in ourselves other oblations," "oblations which the Church has,—without blood, and smoke, and altar, and the rest." "Without altar," let it be observed, which cuts off material sacrifice: as does also the expression, "the rest," by which material sacrifice, for one thing, must be meant. And "without altar and the rest" "the evangelical gift ascends to God,—the pure and undefiled sacrifice." And those other oblations which, he says, the Church has, are the oblation of oneself, of the martyrs, of prayer, of praise, of righteousness, of alms, of joy in victory, of a contrite heart, of preaching, and of bearing fruit. But not a word of a sacrifice or of an oblation of the elements; and this at the end of the fourth century. Nothing of a material sacrifice is in any way to be gathered from this place. And when it is considered that this great Father was professedly enumerating the difference and variety of oblations in the Church, going over them twice, and adding one which he found he had omitted; it must be allowed that the evidence is conclusive against the belief of a material sacrifice in the Eucharist during the four first centuries.

We now, therefore, turn to the enquiry, what was the practice of the Church in her services? did she worship as offering a sacrifice of the bread and wine in the Holy Communion?

Passing over the practice during the lives of the apostles, as it is to be learned from the Acts and the Epistles, in which we do not find a trace of anything nearer an oblation or sacrifice of the elements, than breaking the bread and blessing the cup, we come, about eighty years after the date of the Acts of the Apostles, to Justin Martyr, who gives a sufficiently clear account of the manner in which the Lord's Supper was celebrated in his time. He says: "There are brought to the President of the brethren bread and a cup of water and wine. And he, having taken them, sends up praise and glory to the Father of all through the name of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and at great length makes thanksgiving for having counted us worthy of these things from Him: and he having finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present express aloud their assent, saying, Amen.—And after the giving of thanks by the President, and the loud assent of all the people, they, who with

us are called deacons, give to each of those present to partake of the consecrated bread and wine and water.”²⁰⁶

And about the middle of the fourth century we have a still fuller account of the ceremonies of the Eucharist by Cyril of Jerusalem. He says: “Ye saw the Deacon give to the Priest water to wash, and to the Presbyters who stood round God’s altar.—This washing of hands is a symbol that ye ought to be pure from all sinful and unlawful deeds.—Then the Deacon cries aloud: ‘Receive ye one another; and let us kiss one another.’—This kiss is the sign that our souls are mingled together, and have banished all remembrance of wrongs.—After this the Priest cries aloud, ‘Lift up your hearts.’—Then ye answer, ‘We lift them up unto the Lord.’—Then the Priest says, ‘Let us give thanks to the Lord:’—and ye say, ‘it is meet and right.’—After this we make mention of heaven, and earth, and sea; of the sun and moon; of the stars and all the creation, rational and irrational, visible and invisible.—Then having sanctified ourselves by these spiritual hymns, we call upon the merciful God to send forth His Holy Spirit upon the [gifts] lying before Him (*ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα*), that He may make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ.—Then, after the spiritual sacrifice is perfected, the bloodless service upon that sacrifice of propitiation, we entreat God for the common peace of the Church.—Then after these things we say that prayer which the Saviour delivered to His own disciples.—After this the Priest says: ‘Holy things to holy men.’—After this ye hear the chanter, with a sacred melody, inviting you to the communion of the holy Mysteries.—Then having partaken of the body of Christ, approach also to the cup of His blood.—Then wait for the prayer, and give thanks unto God, who hath accounted thee worthy of so great mysteries.”*²⁰⁷

In these two accounts, then, of the celebration of the Holy Communion in the four first centuries, no trace is to be found

²⁰⁶ Προσφέρετα: τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος· καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν. οἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὄλων διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ἀναπέμπει· καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιώσασθαι τούτων παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται. οὐ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, πᾶς ὁ παρὰν λαὸς ἐπευφήμησεν λέγων, ἄμην.—εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος, καὶ ἐπευφήμησαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ’ ἡμῶν διάκονοι, διδώσιν ἐκάστη τῶν ἐπρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος.—Apol. c. 65.

* On the Mysteries, Catechetical Lectures, Oxford, 1838, pp. 273–279.

²⁰⁷ Ἐσάρακατε τοῖνον τὸν διάκονον τὸν νίψασθαι διδόντα τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ τοῖς κυκλοῦσι τὸ θυματιτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ πρεσβυτέροις.—σύμβολον ἐστὶ τοῦ δεῖν ὑμᾶς καθαρευεῖν πάντων ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ ἀνομημάτων, τὸ νίψασθαι.—εἶτα βοᾷ ὁ διάκονος, ἀλλήλοισ ἀλλήλους ἀσπαζόμεθα ἀπολαβετε.—σημεῖον τοῖνον ἐστὶ τὸ φίλημα τοῦ ἀνακρασθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς, καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξορίξειν μνηστικοίαν.—μετὰ τοῦτο βοᾷ ὁ ἱερεὺς, ἄνω τὰς καρδίας.—εἶτα ἀποκρί-

of the sacrificing of the elements of this sacrament, or the offering them as a sacrifice. In Justin's account, indeed, there is not anything to countenance the supposition, that the elements, by themselves, were an oblation. Nor, in the later account, where we find mention of the invocation of the "Holy Spirit upon the gifts lying" upon the altar, is there anything to lead to the conclusion, that the bread and wine, which were used for the Sacrament, were made an oblation separately from the rest of the "gifts," of which they were part. That they were part of an oblation I do not at all dispute: for we know from Clement of Rome, and others, that there were oblations; and that they were performed with liturgies, and presented by the bishops. And Irenæus shows that there were oblations of the first fruits of God's gifts made at his altar: that these were the new oblation of the New Testament: that they were partly for such as had need, and partly bread and wine of the creature, which were used both for the Sacrament, and, as we learn from other authorities, for the refreshment of the communicants in the *Agapæ* or love feasts.

The question, however, of the oblations and sacrifices which are, or may be, made in the celebration of the Eucharist, will be for consideration in the next chapter. It is sufficient, that we have proved that the Fathers of the two first centuries did not teach the doctrine of a material sacrifice, and that the Church in her worship did not recognise the doctrine of a material sacrifice in the Eucharist.

It may, indeed, be admitted, and it is perfectly true, that, subsequently to the second century, there was a gradual advance of expression among the Fathers; and that in course of time many things were said by them which appear very strongly to favour the theory of a material sacrifice: but it must also be stated, that there are many other things said by them, which utterly contradict and overthrow that theory. And when we

νεσθε, ἔρχομεν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον.—εἶτα ὁ ἱερεὺς λέγει, εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ.—εἶτα λέγετε, ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον.—μετὰ ταῦτα μνημονεύομεν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης, ἄστρων, καὶ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως, λογικῆς τε καὶ ἀλόγου, ὄρατῆς τε καὶ ἀήρατος.—ἀγιάσαντες ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τῶν πνευματικῶν τούτων ὕμνων παρακαλῶμεν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον θεόν, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐξαποστείλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον, σῶμα Χριστοῦ· τὸν δὲ οἶνον, αἷμα Χριστοῦ.—εἶτα μετὰ τὸ ἀπαρισθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀνάμακτον λατρείαν ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ, παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν θεὸν ὑπὲρ κοινῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης.—εἶτα μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν εὐχὴν λέγομεν ἐκείνην. ἦν ὁ Σωτὴρ παρέδωκε τοῖς οἰκείοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς.—μετὰ ταῦτα λέγει ὁ ἱερεὺς τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις.—μετὰ ταῦτα ἀκούετε τοῦ ψάλλοντος μετὰ μέλους θεοῦ, προτρεπομένου ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν κοινῶν τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων.—εἶτα μετὰ τὸ κοινωῆσθαι σε τοῦ σώματος Χριστοῦ, προσέρχου καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ αἵματος.—εἶτα ἀναμείνας τὴν εὐχὴν, εὐχαρίστει τῷ Θεῷ τῷ καταξιώσαντί σε τῶν τηλικούτων μυστηρίων.—Catech. Mystag. V.; Opp. Lut. Par. 1631, pp. 239-245.

find the same writer at one time speaking of the bread and wine as if they were a sacrifice, and at another time expressly rejecting all material sacrifices; it is plain that he must be understood in both cases in one consistent sense; and that he must be so read as rejecting all material sacrifices, but as regarding the bread and wine, as a quasi-sacrifice, or sign of a sacrifice. And this is very far from meeting the necessities of the material schemes.

I cannot close this chapter without a special notice of the way in which Archdeacon Wilberforce wrote on this subject. On the questions: "Is the Holy Eucharist a sacrifice, and is the thing offered the *Sacramentum* only, or the *res Sacramenti* also?"—he says: "In reference to the first opinion," meaning, I suppose, that "the Holy Eucharist" is "a sacrifice,"—"it may be asserted, without fear of contradiction, that no doctrine of the Christian religion is affirmed with more unanimity by all ancient writers, than the truth of the Eucharistic Sacrifice." And he alleges his evidence for this as follows: "St. Clement, the very earliest of all ecclesiastical authorities, writing in the lifetime of Apostles, mentions the 'performing offerings and liturgies,' as the service which our Lord had appointed, and speaks of it as the peculiar function of the ministry, 'to offer the gifts.' St. Ignatius, but little later, uses the word Altar as the habitual name of the Lord's table. Justin Martyr, almost the next Christian writer, besides describing the sacrifice of the Eucharist in his first Apology, twice quotes the prediction of Malachi respecting the Christian service, and says that the sacrifice, which was designed to be offered by the Christian Church, was 'the bread of the Eucharist, and the cup of the Eucharist.' St. Irenæus interprets the same prediction, by saying that it refers to 'the oblation of the Church, which our Lord taught to be offered in the whole world.' And this he explains to be the bread and the cup which is taken from the creation, and which constitute that 'new oblation of the New Testament which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offers throughout the whole world to God.'" * Now, considering that the Archdeacon had before, in this chapter, very clearly distinguished between offering or oblation, and sacrifice: defining the former as "something brought before God—with a view of obtaining His favour": and that sacrifice—involves, in consequence, the further idea of the slaughter of that which is offered": † it is amazing that he should propose these places of

* P. 369.

† P. 349, as before cited.

Clement and the others for proof that they “affirmed”—“the Eucharistic sacrifice” in the sense contended for by him: that is, that the elements, with the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in or under their forms, are the Eucharistic sacrifice. The definition, indeed, is incomplete, for it does not include inanimate sacrifices, which were not slaughtered, but consumed. Probably, he intended to cover the burning of a meat-offering, under “the slaughter of that which was offered”: and in the qualification, “in common,” to leave room for inanimate sacrifices. But the oblations of which these Fathers speak, are not sacrifices, nor can they be made to fulfil the conditions of sacrifice, or, indeed, of offering, as he defines the word: for though they were things brought before God, and presented to Him, there was no thought “of obtaining His favour” by them: there was no idea of their being propitiatory. So that, by the Archdeacon’s definition, they were neither offerings nor sacrifices.

Then, again, that “St. Ignatius uses the word Altar as the habitual name of the Lord’s Table,” is not borne out by the places cited from his writings, as we have seen before: * and how can one interpret of the Lord’s Table, the expression, “within the altar”?

Nor is it correct to say that Justin Martyr describes “the sacrifice of the Eucharist in his first Apology.” He describes the rite of celebration; but he does not call it “the sacrifice of the Eucharist,” as may be seen on referring to the place as given in the present chapter of this work. And although Justin does say: “Concerning the sacrifices that in every place are by us Gentiles offered to Him, that is, the bread of the Eucharist, and the cup likewise of the Eucharist”: he did not use the word sacrifice in a different sense from oblation: nor intend the word in a meaning consistent with the definition of sacrifice as distinguished from offering. And it has been before proved, † that he in reality denied the name of sacrifice to the bread and cup of the Eucharist.

Nor does Justin supply any evidence whatever of the sacrifice of the *res Sacramenti*, without which Archdeacon Wilberforce held that the elements “cannot seriously be looked upon as a becoming offering.” ‡

And in the passages cited from St. Irenæus, and referred to,

* P. 401.

† Pp. 401, 402.

‡ The doctrine of the Holy Euch. c. xi. p. 347.

there is no mention whatever of sacrifice. It is of oblations he speaks, and not of sacrifice.

The Archdeacon goes on to say that the place last cited by him from this Father, namely, that the bread and the cup "constitute that new oblation of the New Testament which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offers throughout the whole world to God," "leads us on to the statement of St. Augustine: 'The Church, from the age of the Apostles, through the sure succession of Bishops, goes on even to our own time, and offers (*immolat*) to God the sacrifice of praise in the Body of Christ. . . . This Church is the spiritual Israel, from which that carnal Israel is discriminated which used to serve in the shadows of sacrifices, by which was typified that singular sacrifice which the spiritual Israel now offers. . . . This last sacrifices to God the sacrifice of praise, not according to the course of Aaron, but according to the course of Melchisedek. . . . Those who read know what Melchisedek brought forth when he blessed Abraham, and if they are now partakers in Him, they see such a sacrifice to be offered throughout the whole world.'" "The sacrifice of praise," undoubtedly means the Eucharistic sacrifice, but the very terms show that it was a sacrifice, not of the bread and wine, with or without the "real presence," but "of praise." And this sacrifice of praise, they who know what Melchisedek brought forth, see in all the world. They know that Melchisedek brought forth bread and wine:—"brought forth," he says, not "offered" or "sacrificed." It is a "sacrifice of praise" in bringing forth bread and wine. It is not the sacrifice of bread and wine with or without the "real presence." It is not the sacrifice of the *Sacramentum* and the *res Sacramenti*.

So illogical and inconclusive is the Archdeacon's argument for his Eucharistic Sacrifice. And so greatly does he fail to prove the assertion which he thought beyond all "contradiction, that no doctrine of the Christian religion is affirmed with more unanimity by all ancient writers, than the truth of the Eucharistic Sacrifice," in his sense of the words.

That, indeed, "the Holy Eucharist was understood to be a sacrifice by the Ancient Church," is unquestionable: but that the elements of bread and wine were understood to be the sacrifice by the Primitive Church,—by that part of the Ancient Church which existed in the first ages,—is quite another proposition, and has never yet been proved. The distinction must ever be remembered between the service or rite of the Eucharist,

and the elements used in it: and the distinction of the senses in which the word sacrifice is employed in either case. The service itself is called the Eucharistic Sacrifice, or the sacrifice; and this most properly, because we do offer sacrifice in it; the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which is the great characteristic of the service; the sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, and of all that we have, which "we offer and present unto" the Lord. But when the elements of bread and wine, either by themselves, or in combination with that which they signify, are spoken of as the Eucharistic Sacrifice made by the priest and the worshippers through him: then a doctrine is enunciated, for proof of which the records of the Primitive Church are searched in vain: and they can only be made to confirm it by an utter confusion of terms, and by, in reality, taking for granted the question to be proved. See how from oblation, the Archdeacon, as is the case usually with the advocates of his doctrine, jumps to sacrifice, taking the two things as identical: and how from sacrifice in the service, a sacrifice which the most ancient Fathers tell us is purely spiritual, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, in the sense of a sacrifice of the signs with the things signified is immediately taken for proved.

It would be to no useful purpose here, to follow the Archdeacon's arguments. Sufficient has been said to show that his doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is not the doctrine of the Primitive Church, as distinguished from that which is merely ancient; and that, therefore, it is not Catholic.

CHAPTER VIII.

ON THE ALLEGED SACRIFICE OF THE "SACRAMENTUM" WITH
THE "RES SACRAMENTI."

IT was stated at the beginning of the third chapter, that "there are four theories or schemes of a proper material sacrifice in the Eucharist: one setting forth a sacrifice of the bare unconsecrated elements of bread and wine; which is Mede's theory: another, setting forth a sacrifice of the consecrated elements, as united and 'replenished with the Holy Spirit'; which is Johnson's theory: a third, setting forth a sacrifice of the elements before consecration, and again of the elements after consecration, as having in, or under, or with them, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ; which is the theory now professed by a party in the Church of England: and the fourth, which is the Roman theory, makes a sacrifice of the elements before consecration, and again, after consecration, offers them up, as no longer, indeed, bread and wine, but as converted into the very substance of the body and blood of Christ."

Each of these systems claims a material sacrifice in the Eucharist, a sacrifice of the bread and wine: three of them, Mede's, the Tractarian,²⁰⁸ and the Roman, a sacrifice of the bare unconsecrated elements; and three of them, Johnson's, the Tractarian, and the Roman, a sacrifice of the consecrated Eucharist:²⁰⁹ two of them, a single sacrifice, Mede's of the unconsecrated, and Johnson's of the consecrated, elements; and two of them, the Tractarian and the Roman, a double sacrifice, first of the elements before consecration, and secondly of the consecrated Eucharist.

And it has been shown that the bread and wine, by themselves at least, are no sacrifice. It has been shown, that, however fit we may conceive them to be for a sacrifice, yet

²⁰⁸ It will be remembered that I do not use this name as one of reproach, but merely for convenience.

²⁰⁹ I make this use of the word for convenience also; because the Roman theory makes this sacrifice to be that of our Lord only; and not at all of the elements.

mere bread and wine without anything else, never were, and never were appointed to be, a sacrifice under the old dispensations. And it has been shown, that there is no sufficient reason for regarding them as a sacrifice under the New Testament dispensation; inasmuch as no proof is to be found of such a sacrifice in its inspired records, or in the doctrine of the primitive Fathers, or in the worship of the primitive, as distinguished from the merely ancient, Church.

Thus, therefore, the sacrificial system of Mede is disposed of, together with so much of the Tractarian and Roman systems as makes a sacrifice of the unconsecrated bread and wine: and the question now to be considered is, whether there is sufficient authority for the compound sacrifices, so to speak, of the Johnsonian, Tractarian, and Roman systems: a sacrifice, that is, to use the language of Archdeacon Wilberforce, of the *Sacramentum* with the *res Sacramenti*.

It will be perceived, however, that the *res Sacramenti* is not the same in all the three systems. The thing received has indeed the same, or nearly the same, name in each: Johnson telling us that the bread and wine are the efficacious vivifying representatives of the body and blood of Christ; the Tractarian and the Roman systems, that under the elements are contained, and we receive, the very true substances of his body and blood. But, in reality, the *res Sacramenti* of Johnson's theory is not the body and blood of Christ: for let it be remembered, that Johnson asserts that "the body of Christ—is as far distant from us as heaven is from the earth"; that his "personal body and blood cannot be substantially present to us on earth"; and that it is impossible to receive his natural body and blood: and again, that it is by the illapse of the Holy Spirit, overshadowing the elements, and uniting with them, they become the body and blood of Christ: and that it is the Holy Spirit, and not the natural body and blood, nor yet the Divinity, of Christ, which is united to the elements, and with them constitutes his sacramental body. Thus, then, though the *virtus Sacramenti* of this system be the body and blood of Christ, or rather the efficacy of his body and blood; yet the *res Sacramenti* of it is, in logical conclusion, not the body and blood of Christ, nor his Divinity, but the Holy Ghost.²¹⁰ And the bread and wine, having this Divine Person in "union" with them, his "power and presence communicated to them," enriching them, working

²¹⁰ He says that "the presence and invisible operation of the Holy Ghost in and by these elements—is the very heart and life of the Sacrament and Sacrifice."—I. 267.

in them, quickening them, and making them "full and big with life," are the "Unbloody Sacrifice" of this theory. Thus not only does this theory of Eucharistic Sacrifice involve, as has been said before,* an impanation, or "a kind of impanation"²¹¹ of the Holy Ghost, or an assumption of the elements into union; but it makes Him even a part of the sacrifice: for this is necessarily involved in his union with the elements, and his presence and power in them.

It is, indeed, but fair to Johnson to state, that he does not appear to have seen that this is the result of his theory. He says of "the ancients," as evidently expressing his own opinion, that—

"When they say that the Spirit 'descended,' and 'gave a contact' to the holy symbols, or that It filled the gifts with 'energy, power,' or the like, they do not mean that the Holy Ghost was united to the Sacrament, as the soul is to a human body, or as the Divine nature was to Christ's natural body; but that the Eucharistical body and blood were so affected by the Spirit in a way imperceptible by us, as to exert Itself in a peculiar manner in and by them, in producing such effects in the receivers as are beneficial to their bodies and souls. The Spirit was never hypostatically united to the natural Body of Christ, but yet did exert Itself in a miraculous manner in and by that Body of His; and though we believe It ceases to act miraculously, yet we doubt not that It is, upon all occasions, ready to work in Its usual method, and to convey Its graces by Its wonted channels to the whole Church and every member." †

He did not hold that the union of the Holy Ghost with the bread and wine was such as to be hypostatical, that is, such that He should be one person with them, as the Divine and human natures of our Lord are one Person. But if the union of the Holy Ghost with the bread and wine be such, that they have his "power and presence," "and invisible operation in" them, quickening them, and making them "full and big with life": then, though the union be not hypostatical, it is most certainly an impanation and invination of the Holy Ghost. And if the bread and wine in this union, with the presence of the Holy Ghost in, with, and working in, them, be the "Unbloody Sacrifice" of the Eucharist, then either the Holy Ghost, impanate and invinate, is Himself a sacrifice, or part of a sacri-

* Chap. III. pp. 324, 325.

²¹¹ Waterland, Review, c. VII. Works, Oxford, 1823, VII. 194. See also Archdeacon Wilberforce, Doct. of the Holy Eucharist, c. X. 312: where are some very judicious observations on the offices and the joint and separate operations of the Three Divine Persons.

† I. 349, Part I. c. ii. sect. I. vi. c. 3.

fice with the bread and wine; or if He be not part of the sacrifice, there is no such sacrifice as Johnson's theory sets forth.

That the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are neither sacrifice nor feast, is abundantly manifest. They have no life to be taken, nor is their substance destroyed by fire; as was the case with the inanimate sacrifices of the law. But the sacrifice for which Johnson so learnedly contends, is not of the bread and wine, but "consists of bread and wine, consecrated into the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ by the secret operation of the Holy Spirit."* And that operation is represented to be by his powerful presence in them, and union with them, by which they are "quicken'd" and "full and big with life."

If, then, they are not by themselves a sacrifice, or the sacrifice: if they are not "The Unbloody Sacrifice" without the presence and union of the Holy Ghost with them; then it is this Divine Person, or his union, or powerful presence with them, which constitutes and is "The Unbloody Sacrifice." But such a sacrifice is an absolute and undeniable impossibility. It is, therefore, as absolutely and undeniably unscriptural to maintain it.

Johnson, indeed, does not produce a single text of Holy Scripture to prove his doctrine of the operation of the Holy Spirit on and in the elements.²¹² The whole strength of his case is in the doctrine of what he calls "the Primitive Church," or of "the ancients." And his followers will, no doubt, say, that there must be some truth in a doctrine for which so strong evidence is to be found in the doctrine and Liturgies of the ancient Church.

It will, therefore, be necessary to make some sufficient enquiry as to what is, in reality, the evidence produced from these sources, and what its real significance is.

The enquiry is interesting and important, because of its bearing on the doctrine of the Eastern Church; and because, as it appears to me at least, more or less misapprehension prevails on the subject.

We have then, first, to enquire what is the evidence for Johnson's doctrine as derived from "the ancients": and secondly, what the evidence amounts to.

This evidence we will take as set forth by Johnson himself:

* I. 5, Prefatory Epistle.

²¹² Except some places which he alleges as a foundation for the belief of "the ancients," that "the symbols" are "consecrated by the Holy Spirit."

for we must suppose that he produced all that his great knowledge of the Fathers could supply.

Let it, therefore, again be stated, that Johnson's doctrine is, that the bread and wine of the Eucharist are made the body and blood of Christ by the operation of the Holy Ghost, the Third Person of the Trinity, communicating his "power and presence" to them, in "union" with them, enriching them, quickening them, and making them "full and big with life," filling them with all the "Divine energy" of Christ's body and blood: and that this is the Eucharistic or "Unbloody" Sacrifice.

We remark, however, on proceeding to review the evidence produced, that none of the witnesses is earlier than the middle of the fourth century: though Johnson tries to corroborate the account he gives of their evidence, by illustrations from preceding writers.

He begins, then, with Theodoret and Cyril of Alexandria; the former saying that Christ "has honoured the visible symbols with the title of His body and blood, not having changed their nature, but having added grace to their nature": and Cyril saying:—

"Lest we should be astounded at seeing flesh and blood set forth on the holy tables of the Churches, condescending as God to our infirmities, He sends a power of life into the [gifts] set forth, and changes them to the energy of His own flesh, that we may have them for a vivifying participation."²¹³

Thus Theodoret says that our Lord "has added grace to nature": and Cyril, that "He sends a power of life" into the elements. But these statements ascribe the change to our Lord Himself: and speak not of any work or office of the Holy Spirit in it.

Chrysostom is the next witness. He says:—

"The Holy Spirit gives His grace,—descends,—touches the "elements "set forth."—"If there were not an earnest of the Spirit now also,—we could not enjoy the mysteries; for without the grace of the Spirit, these could not become the mystical body and blood."—"Thou seest—the Spirit hovering over the "elements "set forth with great abundance."—"Here [on the table] the Lord's body shall lie,—surrounded on all sides by the Spirit."—

²¹³ Αὐτὸς τὰ δρώμενα σύμβολα τῆ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορία τετίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβάλων, ἀλλὰ τῆ φύσει τὴν χάριν προστεθεικώς.—Theod. Dial. I. iv.

²¹⁴ Ἴνα μὴ ἀποναρκήσωμεν σάρκα τε καὶ αἶμα προκειμένα βλέποντες ἐν ἁγίαις τραπέζαις τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, συγκαθιστάμενοι ὡς Θεοὶ ταῖς ἡμετέραις ἀσθενείαις, ἐνίησι τοῖς προκειμένοις δύναμιν ζωῆς, καὶ μεθίστησιν αὐτὰ πρὸς ἐνεργεῖαν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σαρκὸς, ἵνα εἰς μέγεξιν ζωοποιὸν ἔχωμεν αὐτὰ.—Cyril. Alex. apud Victorem Antiochen, Marc. 14.

"Thou hast the body and blood of the Lord, and the Spirit instead of the letter, and grace exceeding human reasoning, and an unspeakable gift."—
 "The priest stands, not bringing down fire, but the Holy Spirit; and makes his supplication at great length, not that some torch kindled from above may consume [the gifts] set forth, but that grace having fallen upon the sacrifice, may by it kindle the souls of all." ²¹⁴

Thus Chrysostom says, that the elements or gifts set forth are not "without the grace of the Spirit"; but that He "descends,—falls upon,—flies with great abundance over them,—touches them,—and surrounds them on all sides." But he does not say that the Holy Spirit enters into the gifts and unites Himself with them, so that, being the Spirit of Christ, He therefore makes them the body and blood of Christ, and is Himself the inward invisible grace.

The next witness cited is Augustine. His evidence is thus represented:—

"St. Augustine calls the invisible power of the Spirit, exerting itself in the Eucharist, 'the virtue of the Sacrament'; for, says he, 'the Sacrament is one thing,' viz. bread and wine, 'the virtue of the Sacrament another,' viz. the efficacious presence of the Divine Spirit; "

And again:—

"This is the bread which came down from heaven.—But as to what concerns the virtue of the sacrament, not as to what concerns the visible sacrament, or sign; and what this virtue is he clearly tells us in these words, where, speaking of the Eucharistical bread, he says that when by the hands of men it is wrought into that visible shape, it is not sanctified into so great a sacrament but by the invisible operation of the Holy Ghost." ²¹⁵

Now, this is not the evidence of Augustine, but of Johnson interpreting Augustine. Augustine does not say, that "the invisible power of the Spirit, exerting itself in the Eucharist,"

²¹⁴ "Οταν δίδω τὴν χάριν τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὅταν κατέλθῃ, ὅταν ἄψῃται τῶν προκειμένων.—Hom. in Cœmet. appel. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἦν ἀρραβὼν τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ νῦν,—οὐκ ἂν μυστηρίων ἀπελάσασαμεν· σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα μυστικὸν οὐκ ἂν πότε γένοιτο τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος χωρὶς.—De Resur. Mort. Σὺ δὲ οὐκ ἐν φάτιν ὄρας, ἀλλ' ἐν θυσιαστηρίῳ, οὐ γυναικα κατέχουσαν, ἀλλ' ἱερέα παρεστῶτα, καὶ Πνεῦμα μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς δαψιλείας τοῖς προκειμένοις ἐφιπτάμενον.—Hom. 24, in Ep. 1 ad Corinth. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐν ταῦθα κείσεται τὸ σῶμα τὸ δεσποτικόν, οὐχ ἔσπαρταρομένον, καθάπερ τότε, ἀλλὰ Πνεύματι πανταχόθεν ἁγίῳ περιστελλόμενον.—De Beato Philogon. Οὐ γὰρ χερουβιμ ἔχεις,—ἀλλὰ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα δεσποτικόν, καὶ Πνεῦμα ἀντὶ γράμματος, καὶ χάριν ὑπερβαίνουσαν λογισμὸν ἀνθρώπινον, καὶ δωρεὰν ἀνεκδιήγητον.—In Ps. 133. Ἔσθηκε γὰρ ὁ ἱερεὺς, οὐ πῦρ καταφέρων, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ τὴν ἰκετερίαν ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται, οὐχ ἵνα τίς λαμπρὸς, ἄνωθεν ἀφθεῖσα καταναλώσῃ τὰ προκείμενα, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡ χάρις ἐπιπεσοῦσα τῇ θυσίᾳ, δι' ἐκείνης τὰς ἀπάντων ἀνάψῃ ψυχάς.—De Sacerdot. III.

²¹⁵ "Aliud est Sacramentum, aliud virtus Sacramenti."—Tract. in Johan. XXVI. "Hic est panis de cœlo descendens."—"Sed quod pertinet ad virtutem Sacramenti, non quod pertinet ad visibile Sacramentum."—Ibid. "Cum per manus hominum ad illam visibilem speciem perducatur, non sanctificatur, ut sit tam magnum sacramentum, nisi operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei."—De Trinitate, III. 4.

is “‘the virtue of the Sacrament.’” Nor does he say, that “‘the virtue of the Sacrament’ is the efficacious presence of the Divine Spirit.” He says merely, that “‘the Sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the Sacrament another.” And by the “‘virtue of the Sacrament,” the context shows that he means, the spiritual, invisible food, “‘the bread which came down from heaven,” “‘the bread” which “‘the altar of God signifies”: or, as he expresses it in another place, “‘the unity of the body and blood of Christ.”²¹⁶

But there remains the statement of Augustine, that “‘the visible species” of the elements “‘is not sanctified to be so great a sacrament, but by the Spirit of God invisibly working”: or in other words, that the Holy Spirit invisibly sanctifies the bread and wine. Still, this does not bear out the doctrine of the union of the Spirit with the elements, and his presence with and in them.

Gaudentius follows: and Johnson says that he, “‘speaking of the Eucharist both as representing Christ’s natural body, and his collective body the Church, has these words:—

“‘As we know that bread is made out of many grains of wheat reduced to meal, and must of necessity be brought to perfection by fire, in this is a figure of Christ’s body rationally conceived; for we know, that it is a body kneaded together out of the multitude of mankind, perfected by the Holy Spirit; for He was conceived of the Holy Spirit.’”²¹⁷

This is the second of two reasons which Gaudentius gives, why our Lord “‘appointed the Sacraments of His body and blood to be offered in the species of bread and wine.” The first is, that

“‘the immaculate Lamb of God might deliver to His purified people a pure sacrifice to be celebrated, without burning, without blood,—and ready and easy for all to offer.”²¹⁸

And the second reason is, that, as bread being composed of many grains of wheat, ground to flour and mixed with water,

²¹⁶ “‘Hujus rei Sacramentum, id est, unitatis corporis et sanguinis Christi.”—Ibid. v. 15.

²¹⁷ “‘Deinde quomodo panem de multis tritici granis in pollinem redactis per aquam confici, et per ignem necesse est consummari; rationabiliter in eo figura accipitur corporis Christi, quia novimus ex multitudine totius generis humani unum esse corpus effectum, per ignem Sancti Spiritus consummatum. Natus est enim de Spiritu Sancto.”—Tractat. in Exod. ii.

²¹⁸ “‘Quod autem sacramenta corporis sui et sanguinis in specie panis et vini offerenda constituit, duplex ratio est. Primum, ut immaculatus Dei Agnus hostiam mundam mundato populo traderet celebrandam, sine ustione, sine sanguine, sine brodio, id est, jure carnum, et quæ omnibus ad offerendum prompta esset ac facilis.”—Ibid.

must be completed by fire; a figure of the body of Christ is reasonably understood in it, since from the multitude of the whole human race, there is one body wrought and perfected by the fire of the Holy Spirit: that in the bread of many grains made by fire, is a figure of the body of Christ, composed of many men, perfected by the Spirit of God. In short, the first reason is, the facility for all men of celebrating the sacrifice: the second, to be a figure of the body of Christ, the Church, which requires the Holy Spirit to make it his body, as the flour of wheat requires the fire to make it into bread. There is nothing in this of the union of the Holy Spirit with the bread and wine, but of their sanctification by Him.

Ephræm Syrus, referring to the angels eating the victuals which Abraham set before them, and the strangeness of incorporeal spirits eating flesh, represents our Lord as having done a much more wonderful thing: "since," says he, "He has given to be eaten and drunk, fire and the spirit, to us who are clothed with flesh, His body, namely, and His blood."²¹⁹ But this cannot serve the purpose: for there is no authority for imagining that He gives us the Holy Spirit to eat. He was not sacrificed for us.

Johnson assumes that "the Spirit" in this place means the third Person of the Trinity. But as Ephræm says just before: "Partake of the immaculate body and blood of thy Lord with most full faith, assured that thou eatest the Lamb Himself wholly. For the mysteries of Christ are immortal fire":²²⁰ it is not at all clear but that by "the Spirit" in the passage before us, he meant, the Spirit or Godhead of our Lord. Albertine very justly observes, that "if the Word had not been incarnate and sacrificed for us,—although as God, He was the food of angels,—yet He could not have been the food of eternal life to us because of our sins. He would have been a devouring fire to us. But on account of that union of the Word with flesh and blood in Christ, Ephræm calls his body and blood fire and Spirit, because they are in personal union with God who is spirit and fire." And he confirms this view by the authority (1) of Tertullian, who says that "the Word who is Spirit and life

²¹⁹ "Ingens sane miraculum est cernere spiritus incorporeos, in terris carnium cibos manducantes; sed hoc profecto excedit omnem mentem, omnemque sermonem, quod nobis fecit unigenitus Christus Salvator noster. Ignem quippe et Spiritum manducandum atque bibendum præstitit nobis carne vestitis, corpus videlicet, et sanguinem suum."—De iis, qui Filii Dei Naturam scrutantur.

²²⁰ "Participa immaculatum corpus et sanguinem Domini tui fide plenissima, certus quod agnum ipsum integre comedas. Ignis immortalis sunt mysteria Christi."—Ibid.

—took flesh—and is therefore to be sought for the source of life, to be devoured by the hearing, and ruminated by the understanding, and digested by faith”: (2) of Athanasius, who says that “the flesh of the Lord is a life-giving Spirit, because it was assumed by a life-giving Spirit”: and (3) of Cyril, of Alexandria, who says that “the Lord calls His flesh Spirit,” alluding to John vi. 63, “It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life”: “because,” says Cyril, “the flesh is perfectly united to Him [or to His Spirit], and has put on His whole vivific power.” *

There is another place of Ephræm not cited by Johnson, very similar to this before us.

“In thy bread is hidden the spirit that cannot be eaten; in thy wine there dwelleth the fire that cannot be drunk. The Spirit in thy bread and the fire in thy cup are distinct miracles, which our lips receive.—A new miracle it is, that our mighty Lord giveth to bodily creatures fire and the Spirit, as food and drink.—Fire and Spirit in the bosom of her that bare thee! Lo! fire and spirit in that river wherein thou wert baptized, fire and spirit in our baptism! In the bread and cup is fire and the Holy Ghost.” †

Taking, then, this place, in conjunction with the following as cited by Johnson:—

“The priesthood—prays the Lord—that the Holy Spirit may come down, and sanctify the gifts set forth on the earth;” ²²¹

it would seem the safer way to interpret Ephræm as meaning, that the Holy Spirit sanctifies the bread and wine, and that our Lord, Himself a Spirit, is in them, and gives Himself to us to eat. This meets Ephræm’s expressions: while Johnson’s application and intended conclusion have, at best, no surer grounds.

The next of Johnson’s authorities, Ambrose, might have been cited in corroboration of the view given above of the passage in Ephræm. He says:—

“Christ is in this sacrament, for it is the body of Christ; therefore it is not corporeal, but spiritual meat. Wherefore the Apostle says, concerning the type of it, ‘Our fathers ate the spiritual food, and drank the

* Albertin, De Euch. II. p. 454; Davent. 1654.

† Select works of Ephræm, Oxford, 1847, pp. 146, 147; Adver. Scrut. Rhyth. X. iii.; V. vii.

²²¹ “Sacerdotium cælum volitans ascendit ad Deum, procidensque [ante excelsum thronum] instanter pro servis orat Dominum, ut Spiritus Sanctus pariter descendat, sanctificetque dona in terris proposita.”—De Sacerdotio.

spiritual drink : ' for the body of God is spiritual body : the body of Christ is the body of the Divine Spirit : because Christ is a spirit.' ²²²

Johnson, indeed, represents the argument of Ambrose thus : "—the Sacramental body of Christ must be a spiritual body, because His natural body is so ; His natural body was formed and sanctified, and had in it a quickening power, by virtue of the Holy Spirit ; therefore His Sacramental body must receive all its excellencies from the same Spirit." I must say, with all respect for so learned and ingenious a writer, that this is a very sophistical representation of Ambrose's argument, and sets forth a very illogical conclusion. Most true that our Lord's "natural body was formed and sanctified, and had in it a quickening power, by virtue of the Holy Spirit." But the third Person did not exclude or dispossess the second. The only begotten Son and Word of God was in personal union with the man Christ Jesus ; and the man had no existence but in union with God. "God and man is one Christ." His body, therefore, as Ambrose says, "is the body of the Divine Spirit." And if the sacramental body be the body of Christ, it must be the body of the same Spirit, and must "receive" some of "its excellencies from the same Spirit." So that the conclusion which Johnson proposes for Ambrose, is not true, that "the Sacramental body must receive all its excellencies from the same Spirit," the third Person, by whom He was conceived.

Nor is the argument of Johnson any more helped by the testimony of his next witness. "Gregory Nyssen, speaking of the Eucharist, says :—

"It is necessary to receive the enlivening power of the Spirit in a way naturally possible ; but it is the Divine body [of Christ] only that has received this grace. We ought to consider how it is possible that this one body, being shared among so many myriads of believers—should remain entire." ²²³

It is not necessary to object to the translation "the Divine body of Christ" : for his natural body "received God" (Heb. x. 5), and his Sacramental body does, in a sense, receive God

²²² "In illo sacramento Christus est, quia corpus est Christi: non ergo corporalis esca, sed spiritalis est. Unde Apostolus de typo ejus ait; quia 'Patres nostri escam spiritalem manducaverunt, et potum spiritalem biberunt;' corpus enim Dei corpus est spiritale: corpus Christi corpus est Divini Spiritus; quia Spiritus est Christus."—De Mysteriis, c. 9.

²²³ 'Επαγωγῆς κατὰ τὸν δυνατὸν τῇ φύσει τρόπον τὴν ζωοποιὸν δύναμιν τοῦ Πνεύματος δέξασθαι μόνον δὲ τοῦ θεοδόχου σώματος ἐκείνου ταύτην δεξαμένου τὴν χάριν.—Orat. Mag. Cat. c. 17.

also, since it is his body. The body of Christ, then, "having received God," is a Divine body: and in the words of Gregory, it is the "only" body "that has received this grace." But no proof can be extracted from this place for the union and presence of the Holy Spirit with and in the elements of the Eucharist.

Then Johnson brings in Optatus, speaking of "the altars on which the Holy Ghost descended": Epiphanius, who says that "the power of that bread is to vivification": and Augustine, speaking of "the virtue of the Sacrament." But these fall far short of the necessities of his theory: for if they were put together as the testimony of one person, they would amount to no more, than that the Holy Ghost descended upon the altar, and communicated to the bread a vivifying power.

From Augustine's phrase "the virtue of the Sacrament," Johnson goes on to say, that "this shews what St. Gregory Nazianzen means, when he said, that 'by the unbloody sacrifice we communicate of the passion of Christ, and the Divinity;' and when he calls the altar, 'the table that receives God.'²²⁴ For by the Divinity, we are not to understand the Divine nature of Christ."²²⁵ But the original, as seen in the note below, will not bear out this assertion, that "we are not to understand the

²²⁴ Καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἀφαρνίξεται τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας ἀποκαθαίρων, δι' ἧς ἡμεῖς Χριστῷ κοινωνοῦμεν, καὶ τῶν παθημάτων καὶ τῆς θεότητος.—Orat. 4 in Julian. ἡ θεοδόχος τράπεζα.—Carmen Iambic., 34.

²²⁵ That "by the Divinity we are not to understand the Divine nature of Christ," Johnson attempts to corroborate by the assertion, that "it does not appear that the ancient Church thought that believers received that in any sense, but only as the union betwixt Christ and His Church is by means of the Holy Spirit's presence in the Sacraments." But these observations cannot be admitted. Whether they furnish a correct representation or not of the opinion of the ancient Church, we shall not stop to enquire: but that this representation is thoroughly unscriptural, there can be no doubt. For, first, the Christian is "partaker of the Divine nature": and, dwelling "in love, he dwelleth in God, and God in him." And secondly, not only so, but, "if any man love me," says Christ, "he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come to him, and make our abode with him." Believers have "put on Christ": Christ is "formed in them": He "dwells in their heart by faith": they "have received Him": He is in them; and they are in Him. And thirdly, the Holy Spirit is in them, and "dwelleth with" them, and in them, and they in Him.* That the belief of the first ages of the "ancient Church," that is, of the primitive Church,—for the distinction is too commonly overlooked,—was in perfect accord with all this, no one will dispute. As it is the doctrine of Holy Scripture, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are and dwell in faithful Christians, and that such, therefore, "communicate—of the Divinity" of the whole three Persons, of the whole Godhead; so it must have been the doctrine of those who were taught by our Lord and his Apostles. Whatsoever, therefore, may have been the belief of later ages of the "ancient Church" on this point, those ages can have but little authority by themselves, and certainly can have no authority, if inconsistent with this belief of the Church at the beginning.

If it be said, that although faithful Christians are "partakers of the Divine nature" without distinction of the persons of the Godhead, it is nevertheless, as

* 2 Pet. i. 4; 1 Jno. iv. 12, 15, 16.—Jno. xiv. 23; Gal. iii. 27; Rom. xiii. 14; Gal. iv. 19; Eph. iii. 17; Col. ii. 6; 2 Cor. xiii. 5; 1 Jno. v. 20.—Rom. viii. 9, 11; Jno. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Tim. i. 14.

Divine nature of Christ," as meant in this place. On the contrary, if, as I submit, the true translation of the words be: "we partake with Christ, both in his sufferings and in his Godhead," it is the Divine nature of Christ that we are to understand by the Divinity.

Nor will the expression: "the table that receives God," yield any better support to Johnson's doctrine; for, instead of taking, as in fact he does take, the word "God" to mean the Holy Ghost, and then using it to prove that it does mean the Holy Ghost,—which, in short, is to beg the question: the question must first be itself proved. And this is not done.

Cyril of Jerusalem is next cited. "We beseech God who is a lover of souls, to send down His Holy Spirit on the [gifts] laid in open view, that He may make the bread the body of Christ, the wine the blood of Christ. For to whatsoever the Holy Ghost gives a contact, that thing is consecrated and changed."²²⁶ This is, in fact, part of Cyril's description of the Liturgy, as it was used in his Church: and it, will, therefore, more properly come in for consideration when the ancient Liturgies shall be before us.

References follow to several writers of that period, whose

Johnson says, "only as the union betwixt Christ and His Church is by means of the Holy Spirit's presence in the Sacraments": the answer is, that no such explanation or condition is annexed by our Lord and his Apostles to statements like those quoted above. When our Lord said, "If a man love me," he does not add, "the Holy Ghost will come to him, and since He is one with the Father and with me, and will be with the Church in my stead, not only He, but the Father and I will thus by the Spirit come to him": but he says, "My Father will love him, and we will come to him, and make our abode with him."

Again, although "we are baptized by one Spirit into one body," and by that Spirit we in baptism "put on Christ," and Christ is "formed in" us: yet the Holy Spirit is not alone: we are baptized into Christ. Nay, we are baptized into the whole three Persons together: for if baptism into the name of Christ be, as the Scripture shows that it is, baptism into Christ; we being baptized "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," are baptized into each and all the Persons. At the same moment we are baptized into them all, and are made partakers of the divine nature of all and of each.

Johnson's expression, indeed, is somewhat obscure. But I take him to mean that "believers" do not "in any sense" receive "the Divine nature of Christ—but only" in this one way; namely, that the Holy Spirit is in the Sacraments, imparting or uniting his Divine nature to them: so by them He imparts that nature to the Church. And He, being one with Christ, thus effects "the union betwixt Christ and his Church." But the work of the Spirit upon believers is not confined to the Sacraments: and therefore, if they are partakers of the Divine nature of Christ, only because the Son and the Spirit of God are one, and they who partake of the Spirit partake in and by Him of the Son: the participation of the Divine nature of Christ would not be limited to the Sacraments. It cannot, therefore, be true that "believers do not in any sense" receive the Divine nature of Christ, but only by the Sacraments." And, consequently, this could not have been the belief of the Primitive part of the "ancient Church."

²²⁶ Παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν φιλόθρωπον Θεόν, τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐξαποστείλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα: ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα Χριστοῦ. πάντως γὰρ οὗ ἕαν ἐφάσταιτο τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τούτο ἤγίασται καὶ μεταβέβληται.—Cat. Myst. V.

expressions Johnson ingeniously perverts into proof of his doctrine. He says that the above passage of Cyril "lets us into the meaning of St. Ambrose, when he calls the Sacramental bread, 'a spiritual body,' and 'the body of the Divine Spirit:'" that is to say, that the bread of the Eucharist is a spiritual body, and the body of the Divine Spirit, only by reason of the descent and contact of the Holy Ghost. But the words of St. Ambrose are totally inconsistent with this representation of his meaning. He says: "Christ is in that sacrament; because it is the body of Christ: it is therefore not corporal but spiritual, food. Whence the Apostle speaks of its type; 'for our fathers did eat spiritual food, and did drink spiritual drink'; for the body of God is a spiritual body: the body of Christ is the body of the divine Spirit; because Christ is a Spirit."²²⁷ Thus, according to St. Ambrose, the Sacrament is spiritual food, because it is the body of Christ; and Christ is God, and his body therefore is a spiritual body. It is the body of the Divine Spirit, because Christ who is in it, and whose body it is, is a Spirit. And this is very unlike the assertion, that the Sacrament is the body of the Divine Spirit or a spiritual body, only by reason of the descent and contact of the Holy Ghost.

Nor is there any proof of this to be found in the statement of Julius Firmicus, who comes next, that "Christ delivered to His disciples the substance of Majesty," and that this is "the grace of salutary food":²²⁸ unless we are to take the meaning of this writer from the mere assertion of Johnson, that by these expressions were intended "the holy symbols ennobled" only "by the peculiar presence of the Spirit, and thereby made the body and blood in power and effect." But here again there is great inconsistency between the real words of Julius and the doctrine which they are cited to confirm. Johnson represents him as saying, that "Christ delivered the substance of Majesty": whereas he said: "the substance of His own Majesty" the two words omitted in the citation being directly opposed to Johnson's theory.

Again, that Gelasius calls "the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ a divine thing," and says "that the elements of

²²⁷ "In illo sacramento Christus est; quia corpus est Christi: non ergo corporalis scilicet, sed spiritalis est. Unde Apostolus de typo ejus ait: quia *patres nostri escam spiritalem manducaverunt, et potum spiritalem biberunt*; corpus enim Dei corpus est spiritale; corpus Christi corpus est divini Spiritus; quia Spiritus est Christus."—De Lysteriis, c. 9.

²²⁸ "Et rursus Ipse, ut majestatis suæ substantiam credentibus traderet, ait, 'Nisi ederitis carnem Filii Hominis.' &c.; quare nihil vobis cum tympanis, cibo odii, miseri mortales: salutaris cibi gratiam quærite, et immortale poculum bibite."—De Errore cotan. Relig.

the Eucharist pass, by the operation of the Holy Spirit into a Divine Substance": can only be taken to mean, that they are made most holy "by the operation of the Holy Spirit"; for that they literally pass into "a Divine Substance," and thus become God, no one would say. The Roman doctrine does not go quite so far as this, though it does very nearly. That St. Athanasius says that "Christ predicates of Himself both flesh and spirit," and calls the Eucharist "heavenly, spiritual food": is evidently nothing to the purpose, but rather against it, since our Lord "predicates—Spirit of Himself." Nor does it make more for Johnson's doctrine, that St. Cyprian speaks of "the salutary grace" of the Sacrament. It may, indeed, be, as Johnson says, that "he calls the material Eucharist 'salutary grace,' on account of the presence of the Holy Spirit"; but Cyprian himself does not, in any of the places, at least, cited by Johnson, tell us this. And if Origen says that "the loaves are made a certain holy body by prayer," he can only mean what Gelasius meant by calling them a Divine Substance. A belief that the elements are sanctified by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and are changed by Him into the body and blood of Christ; and that they thus become "a Divine thing" or "Substance," "heavenly, spiritual food," does not at all imply that the change is made by the union of the Spirit with the bread and wine, and his presence in and with them.

I will not detain the reader by pursuing Johnson through the rest of his imaginary proofs, or rather illustrations; but will conclude the series with the Liturgies; premising merely, that though I accept these very valuable documents for the present purpose, in the condition in which we have them, I am strongly of opinion, that their original condition was very different. The ceremonies of the rite must have been much more simple when the Liturgies were originally used; and they must have been free from all such things as making the holy oblation, in honour of the Virgin Mary, the prophets, apostles, and saints. I think, indeed, that they who would restore the Liturgies to anything like their original condition, must be content to expunge from them every ceremony and every word which advances beyond the plain doctrine of Scripture, and the clear and true tradition of the Church from the beginning.

The evidence of Cyril of Jerusalem, however, before cited, shows that the Liturgy of his Church and time contained a prayer for the descent of the Spirit upon the bread and wine. And therefore this clause of the Liturgies, whensoever intro-

duced, is as old, at least, as the early part of the fourth century. I do not think, for reasons which may be stated elsewhere, that it could have been part of any primitive Liturgy.

There is a great variety of expressions in the Liturgies. Of the eight Liturgies given by Dr. Neale, the subject of their invocations is, to send the Holy Ghost upon us, and upon the bread and cup. And the immediate purpose of the descent of the Spirit upon them is expressed in the Clementine Liturgy to be, "that He may exhibit"—in the Armenian, to "bless—so as to make,"—in St. James's and St. Mark's to "sanctify and make,"—the bread the body, and the cup the blood, of Christ. In the Liturgy of Theodore the Interpreter, it is, "that they may become the holy body and the blood" of Christ.

In the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, God is supplicated Himself to "make this bread the precious body of Christ, and that which is in the cup the precious blood of Christ": and in the Sacramentary of Gregory the prayer is, that "God would deign to make the oblation blessed—that it may become the body and blood of His most dear Son." The Armenian prays the "Good God" to "bless" the bread and cup "so as to make them," &c.

And the prayer of an "old Gallican missal," as cited by Johnson, is, that "Almighty God" would "let His Holy Word, and the Spirit, descend on" the oblation.

The Liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, and the Armenian Liturgy, have the clause, "changing them by the Holy Ghost."

The Liturgy of St. Peter prays our Lord Himself: "Look upon us, and upon this bread and upon this cup, and make it thy undefiled body, and precious blood." And the Coptic St. Basil's prays, that the "Holy Ghost may come upon us and upon these proffered gifts—and may make them."

And in another "old Gallican" form referred to by Johnson, the prayer is: "Come, Holy Ghost, the sanctifier, and bless this sacrifice."

The ultimate purpose also, or benefit to the communicants, of the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements, is set forth in a different way in each Liturgy.

But in all the Liturgies exhibited in Dr. Neale's work, and in the Clementine Liturgy and another to which Johnson refers, here is an invocation, in different terms, of the Holy Spirit upon the elements. It must, therefore, be admitted that the

invocation is of very ancient date. But, as it is not found in all ancient Liturgies, there is a strong presumption, if not proof, in this fact, that it is not Catholic.

Now, out of the eight Liturgies given by Dr. Neale, and five more cited by Johnson, there are only three which directly attribute the perfecting of the Sacrament to the Third Person of the Trinity: the Liturgy of St. James, which prays that "He may hallow and make,"—the Liturgy of St. Mark,—praying that "He may sanctify and perfect and make,"—and the Coptic St. Basil, praying that He "may make,"—the bread and cup the body and blood of the Lord. But when the prayer is, that God would send down his Holy Spirit and make, the meaning, clearly, must be, that He should send the Spirit to make, or that by the Spirit He should make. So that, in these invocations, the making the bread to be the body, and the wine to be the blood of Christ, is conceived to be the immediate operation of the third Person of the Trinity.

The question, therefore, now is, in what sense the bread and wine were believed to be made the body and blood of Christ.

Now, first, it was not conceived that any change took place in the elements themselves, in their nature or substance. Of this the distinct statement of Theodoret, that it was "not changing their nature," is sufficient proof. It was not imagined that they lost any of their natural properties: for they were said to be still such, that "our blood and flesh are nourished," "increased, and supported" by them.*

But being taken and set forth, they were, after "the invocation of God," no longer common: they were no longer simple or "common bread and wine," but "Eucharistized" and sanctified. Thus they were not themselves, or in themselves, the body and blood of Christ: neither was there any imagination that the body and blood of Christ were in them. They were, in a sense, the body and blood of Christ, and were so called. The prayer was that they might be made, and they were, the body and blood of Christ,—for a purpose, be it carefully noticed. The invocation of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, for instance, as an example of all the rest, runs thus: "We pray thee,—O Good Lord,—to send down—on us, and on these loaves, and on these cups, the Holy Ghost, that He may sanctify and perfect them, as Almighty God. And make this bread the body, and this cup the blood of the New Testament of our very Lord God

* Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I. c. 66; Irenæus, V. 2.

and Saviour and universal King, Jesus Christ:—that they may be to those that participate for purification of soul, forgiveness of sins, communion of the Holy Ghost, fulfilment of the kingdom of heaven, boldness towards thee, and not to judgment nor to condemnation.”

To effect purposes like these, the Holy Spirit was invoked to make the bread the body, and the wine the blood, of Christ. So that, though they were not themselves, and had not in themselves, yet in power and effect they were, that which the prayer desired they might be made.

No infusion of the Spirit into them was imagined: no incorporation of the Spirit with them: no assumption of them into union: no impanation and invination of the Spirit. For such purposes as the invocation expressed, the bread was the body of Christ, and the wine was his blood: but, beyond this, the invocations do not seem to promote any decision.

The elements were still bread and wine, with all their natural properties as before: but they were not common, they were holy. They were sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and “changed” by Him from common into holy, from mere bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. They were not in strict existence, neither had they in them, our Lord’s body and blood: but, so far as the purposes expressed did require, they were truly “the very precious and holy body and blood” of the Son of God.

Such were the conclusions, and such only, as it appears to me, which the invocations of the Holy Ghost in these Liturgies dictate. And they are very far short of the doctrine which Johnson laboured to establish.

From this review of the evidence proposed by Johnson in behalf of his doctrine, we must now consider what it really amounts to.

But in such enquiries one caution is very necessary. In the investigation of Scriptural evidence, we are entitled to accumulate text upon text, not from one book only, but from every book of which the Bible is composed; to add them one to another, and draw out the full result of all: and for this reason, that all the Books of Holy Scripture are given by one Spirit. But not so with human testimony. We must not, as Johnson, indeed, not seldom does, put Father to Father, and taking the sum of their statements together, bring it forth as the doctrine of their

age: but we must subtract their differences, and then, in the residuum we shall find that which all those Fathers held in common. In this only is to be found the true doctrine of their time.

Now we have somewhat sifted the evidence before us: and we have found that Theodoret and Cyril of Alexandria ascribe the change of the elements into our Lord's body and blood to our Lord Himself: that the testimony of Ephrem Syrus is so doubtful as to give no certain support to the case: that Ambrose is altogether adverse to Johnson, as also Gregory Nyssen: that Optatus and Epiphanius contribute nothing: that Gregory Nazianzen and Julius Firmicus are no more favourable than Ambrose: that neither Gelasius nor Athanasius, Cyprian nor Origen, go, in reality, farther than to say, that the elements of the Eucharist are sanctified by the operation of the Holy Ghost: and that Augustine, in saying that "the visible species is not sanctified to be so great a sacrament but by the Spirit of God invisibly working"; and Gaudentius, in saying that the "figure of Christ's body—is perfected by the Holy Spirit"; only in other words say the same thing, namely, that the bread and wine are sanctified by the Spirit.

What this sanctification is, will be considered in another place.

But now, out of the list of Johnson's testimonies there remain only Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, and the Liturgies.

Chrysostom, then, says, that "without the grace of the Spirit, there could not be the mystical body and blood": and it was his opinion, that "the priest brings down the Holy Spirit,"—who "descends,—touches" the elements, and so "gives His grace." Cyril also says that "the Holy Ghost gives a contact" to them and so makes them the body and blood of Christ. But he adds, that, "to whatsoever He gives a contact, that thing is consecrated and changed": from which the conclusion is, that by "contact" of the Spirit, the bread and wine are sanctified, changed, and made the body and blood of the Lord. Of this change we shall speak presently, when we come back to the Liturgies.

Chrysostom, moreover, says: "Thou seest the Spirit hovering over the elements set forth, with great abundance," and that "the Lord's body lies surrounded on all sides by the Spirit." And these are, evidently, figurative expressions, whose literal meaning will not establish such a presence of the Spirit with and in the elements, and in union with them, as Johnson's

theory sets forth and requires. It would not be safe to state that meaning differently from that of the Liturgies. And to these, then, we now return.

They pray that God, by his Spirit, would make, that He would send Him down to make, the bread the body, and the wine the blood of Christ, that they might be or become to those who participate in them, for remission of sins and other spiritual blessings. And, surely, this is not anything like a prayer, that God would so unite his Holy Spirit with the elements, and make them in such manner the body and blood of Christ, that they might offer them up as a sacrifice to Him.

The Liturgies, indeed, as exhibited by Dr. Neale, do not offer such a sacrifice. After the invocation, the plain meaning of which is, that the bread and wine are made the body and blood of Christ, not by the words of institution, or by them alone, but by the subsequent prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them: there is no word of offering up Christ, or his body and blood to God. There is no word of sacrifice then, but in the Syriac Liturgy of St. James, and the Armenian Liturgy,* which seems now to be in use in Russia, and evidently cannot, in its present state, be cited as evidence of ancient doctrine or practice. But of the places in the Armenian Liturgy to which I allude, and references to which will be found below, I have to remark, that in the first which runs thus: "Spirit of God—who performest the mystery of Him, who together with Thee is glorified through our hands, by the pouring forth of His blood, we beseech Thee—by this sacrifice † bestow charity, &c. Bestow on us, by this sacrifice, † a healthy state of the atmosphere.—By this sacrifice † give rest to all those Bishops who have departed in Christ," &c.—it does not seem to be quite clear, that the sacrifice means a sacrifice of our Lord, or of his body and blood, offered up to God by the Priest, and not our Lord's own sacrifice of Himself. In the third and fourth places: "the Priest who offers this sacrifice"; the whole service, or the immediately preceding prayers and intercessions, may be meant. The second place is this: "We offer unto Thee, O Lord our God, our thanksgivings and praise for that most holy and immortal sacrifice which is now on the holy Table." And here, I remark, it is not said, as the theory of offering up Christ to God would require,—“We offer to Thee, O Lord, this most holy and immortal sacrifice”: but, “we offer our thanksgivings—for that

* Neale II. 705; 590, 606, 610, 614.

† The word "sacrifice" is not in Mr. Malan's translation, pp. 41, 42.

—sacrifice which is now on the holy Table.” And the difference is most important: for when it is believed that the bread is made the body of Christ which was given for us, and the wine his blood which was shed for us, then there is the sacrifice of Christ made by Himself, once for all for us, and not a sacrifice of Him made or offered up by his Church or his ministers to God. And I do not find anything in this Liturgy inconsistent with this remark.

The Syriac Liturgy of St. James, after the words of institution and the invocation of the Holy Ghost, has these words: “We offer unto Thee [this unbloody sacrifice?] for the holy Sion,” &c.* This is addressed to the Father of the only begotten Son. But before both the words of institution and the invocation, we find this addressed to our Lord: “we offer to Thee this unbloody sacrifice.” Now there were not two “unbloody sacrifices” offered by this Liturgy: and therefore the “unbloody sacrifice” must be the same in both places. But there was the “unbloody sacrifice” offered before the consecration, and therefore before it was made the body and blood of Christ. And moreover the “unbloody sacrifice” was offered to Christ Himself: a very plain inconsistency, if the offering were of his body and blood. To offer Him up to Himself is, I believe, an unheard of thing, and certainly most anomalous. It must have been the same sacrifice in both places, and therefore not of the body and blood of Christ.

It would not be fair to omit the remark, that, according to Dr. Neale’s account, some of the “Syro-Jacobite Liturgies” † have an oblation of the “unbloody sacrifice,” after the invocation of the Holy Ghost; but I apprehend that their authority is not of such account that we need notice them further: and that by “unbloody sacrifice,” the offering up of our Lord’s body and blood, or of Himself, was not meant.

Enough has been said, as I think, to show that the Liturgies which pray for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the elements to make them the body and blood of Christ, do not offer them up when they are so made, as a sacrifice to God; neither that they were so made by union of the Holy Spirit with them. But a little more may be said to reinforce these conclusions.

The consecration of the elements, notwithstanding any arguments on the side of Rome and her adherents, is, by the plain language of the Liturgies of which I have been speaking, com-

* Neale II. 706.

† I. 490.

pleted only by the prayer of invocation following the words of institution. In fact, according to them, the bread is made the body of Christ, and the wine his blood, only by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon them. And the language of the Liturgies, before and after this consecration, must be particularly noticed, in order to see what their sacrifice in the Eucharist really was; that is, whether there was any idea in them of such union of the Holy Spirit with the elements as Johnson imagined, or of offering up Christ, or his body and blood, to God.

Now in that part of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom which is called the Prothesis,—the first part of the Service just after the elements have been brought forth,—the Priest performs upon the bread, with a spear, a kind of representation of the sacrifice of our Lord: and the bread being divided by him into many portions, he takes one, saying: “In honour of the most excellent and glorious Lady, the Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary, by whose intercessions receive, O Lord, this Sacrifice to Thy heavenly Altar.”* The other portions also he takes successively in honour of the Baptist, of Moses, David, and the Prophets, of the Apostles, of the Fathers and Doctors, of the Martyrs, and of all Saints.† After which he prays: “O God our God,—Thyself bless this oblation, and receive it to thy heavenly Altar.”† And shortly after, the Deacon says: “It is time to sacrifice to the Lord.”†

In the pro-anaphoral part of the Liturgies, we find in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom the prayer: “make us worthy to offer to Thee supplications and prayers and unbloody sacrifices for all Thy people”:‡ the acknowledgment that our Lord did “give to us the Hierurgy of this liturgic and unbloody sacrifice”;‡ and again the prayer of the Priest to our Lord: “strengthen, with the might of Thy Holy Ghost, me that have been endued with the grace of Priesthood, that I may stand by this Thy holy table, and sacrifice (*ἱερουργήσαι*) thy holy and spotless body, and precious blood.”‡ This offering and sacrifice, he presently calls “gifts,” saying: “condescend that these gifts may be offered to Thee, by me a sinner.” They are also again called “the precious gifts that have been proposed,” with “supplications to the Lord” for them.§ “The prayer of oblation, after the Divine gifts are placed on the holy Table,” is too

* Neale 345.

† Neale I. 346. &c., 350, 352, 354.

‡ Ibid. 426, 428, 432, 433, 434. This is peculiar to St. Chrysostom's Liturgy.

§ Ibid. 440.

important to abridge and is as follows: "Lord God Almighty, who receivest the sacrifice of praise from them that call upon Thee with their whole heart, receive also the supplication of us sinners, and cause it to approach to thy holy Altar, and enable us to present gifts to Thee, and spiritual sacrifices for our sins, and for the errors of the people: and grant us to find grace in Thy sight, that [this *] our sacrifice may be acceptable unto Thee, and that the good Spirit of Thy grace may tabernacle upon us and upon these gifts presented unto Thee, and upon all Thy people." †

Again, in the Anaphora, after the words of institution, it is said in this Liturgy: "In behalf of all, we offer Thee Thine own of Thine own.—Moreover we offer unto Thee this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice."²²⁹ And this is followed by the invocation: ‡ "Send down Thy Holy Ghost upon us, and upon these proposed gifts,—and make this bread the precious body of Thy Christ,—and that which is in this cup the precious blood of Thy Christ,—changing them by the Holy Ghost."

In the pro-anaphoral portion of the Coptic Liturgy of St. Basil, mention is made of "this sacrifice of benediction": and it has the prayer: "Grant that we may offer unto Thee reasonable sacrifices, sacrifices of benediction, and spiritual incense": and again: "we offer to Thee this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice." And in the same portion of the service, the Armenian Liturgy calls the Eucharist an "awful and unspeakable mystery." §

Now, taking these Liturgies, and especially the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, as a fair representation of the others, we see what high terms are used before the consecration of the elements. These either by themselves, or in union with the prayers and thanksgivings, are called sacrifice,²³⁰ oblation, Divine and precious gifts, unbloody sacrifice, sacrifices of benediction, the tremendous and unbloody sacrifice, the awful and unspeak-

* An interpolation.

† Neale 444.

²²⁹ 362. St. Mark's has: "We have set before Thee Thine own of Thine own gifts." The Coptic St. Basil, "We offer to Thee these gifts of Thy good things, for all, of all, and in all."

‡ *λαρπέλα*.

§ 381, 393, 429, 444.

²³⁰ "By the name of sacrifice, gift, or present, first the oblation of the people is meant, that consisteth in bread and wine, brought and set upon the Lord's table. In which, again, two things are to be considered: the outward action, and that which is signified thereby; to wit, the people's dedicating themselves and all that they have to God by faith and devotion, and offering to Him the sacrifice of praise."—Field on the Church, Append. Book III. Cambridge, 1849, II. 60, 61.

able mystery. Such was the language of the Liturgies, before the consecration, and even the words of institution. And after the recital of our Lord's words, the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom says: "we offer unto Thee this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice (*λατρεία*); and that of St. James has "this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice" (*θυσίαν*).*

But when the bread and wine have been made the body and blood of Christ, by the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the change thereupon wrought by Him; there is no such language as the doctrine of the union of the Holy Spirit with the bread and wine requires: and with the exceptions of the Syriac Liturgy of St. James, and the Armenian Liturgy, as has been noticed and explained, there is no such language, as the offering of the very true precious body and blood of Christ, as a sacrifice to the Almighty, would demand.

The Roman Liturgy is consistent with this doctrine of sacrifice, and carries it out: for immediately after the consecration it goes on thus: "Wherefore, O Lord, we thy servants, as also thy holy people,—offer unto thy most excellent Majesty of thy gifts bestowed upon us a pure Victim, a holy Victim, an unspotted Victim, the Holy Bread of eternal life and Chalice of everlasting salvation." The idea, indeed, is not carried out fully even in this Liturgy: for it is not clearly expressed that it is Christ Himself, or his very body and blood, which is offered; but the Holy Bread of eternal life, and the Chalice of everlasting salvation, and the petition that God would "vouchsafe to look with a propitious and serene countenance, and to accept" the offering of the body and blood of Christ, indeed of Christ Himself, would be inconsistent with itself.

In the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom we find only this oblation: "We offer to Thee this reasonable service": but neither in this nor in any other of the Liturgies set forth by Dr. Neale,—and I take these as fair representatives in all essential things of all the old Services,—do I find any oblation of THE SACRIFICE; any oblation of the elements as being, as changed into, or as having in them, the very body and blood of Christ. They are called by very high names, but not such as this doctrine would require: "Hallowed things; † venerable gifts; ‡ divine, holy, spiritual, immortal, heavenly, life-giving, and terrible mysteries; § divine, holy, heavenly, immortal, and most pure, incorruptible, and

* 562, 563.

† St. Bas. (Neale) 615.

‡ St. Chrysost. 610.

§ Id. 690.

awful mysteries; * holy and spotless mysteries; † celestial, ineffable, stainless, glorious, terrible, tremendous, divine gifts of the Lord God; ‡ excellent, holy, quickening, and life-giving mysteries.” § Such was the language of the Liturgies before the consecration. With such words the bread and wine were offered, while they were not as yet supposed to have been changed into the body and blood of Christ: nor regarded as sanctified by the descent of the Spirit upon them. They, with the prayers and thanksgivings, were “The unbloody sacrifice.”

But not one word can I find befitting the theory of an offering, by the Church, of that most awful, most tremendous, and most precious sacrifice of the Son of God.²³¹ Whereas, if such language was used, as we have seen, in the oblation of the unconsecrated elements, what language would have been used in an oblation so incomparable as that of the body and blood of the Lord! No ceremonies could be too solemn for such a sacrifice, no language too high or impassioned. But corrupt and imbued with false doctrines as the Liturgies are in their present state, the conception of such a sacrifice to be offered by human hands was the sin of a later and much more corrupt age than theirs. From this they seem to me to be wholly free.

It is very clear, then, first, that there was no idea in the Fathers cited, or in the Liturgies, of the bread and wine being made, or changed into, the body and blood of Christ, by the presence of the Holy Spirit in them, and his union with them: and secondly, that in point of fact, no oblation of such a sacrifice was made in the Liturgies. A sanctification of the elements by the Holy Spirit was believed to make them the body and blood of the Lord, not in themselves, but so far as to effect certain purposes: nor is there any clear proof that when so sanctified, they were offered as a sacrifice to God. There was no sacrifice of the elements as the *sacramentum*, or of the Spirit with them, as the *res sacramenti*, after the invocation.

In the Tractarian and Roman systems, the *res sacramenti* is the body and blood of Christ: and this *res sacramenti* is, in the

* Armen. 686.

† St. Jas. 683.

‡ Id. 611.

§ Theodore, 703.

²³¹ One of the two versions given by Dr. Neale, of the Liturgy of Theodore the Interpreter has: “We offer before Thee—this lively and holy sacrifice, which is the mystery of the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world: praying and beseeching Thy adorable divinity of Thy mercy to receive this pure and holy oblation by which Thou art appeased and reconciled for the sins of the world.” But these expressions are before the invocation: and that which is offered is “the mystery of the Lamb of God.”

former, the principal part of the Eucharistic sacrifice; but it is the whole of the sacrifice in the latter: that is to say, that in the Tractarian system, the body and blood of Christ are considered to be in the bread and wine; both the outward and the inward part being the sacrifice: and in the Roman system, there is no more bread and wine after consecration; the accidents only remain, and the sacrifice is of Christ Himself, not with the elements, but only under their species. The difference between the two systems is of no real importance: it is merely metaphysical; and it is entirely obliterated by metaphysical explanations. It is of no importance whether the bread and wine remain in their proper substances, or whether substance be so defined as to be a thing of mere imagination; so long as Christ is believed to be really present in what either is, or appear to be, bread and wine. One system annihilates the *sacramentum* by change of substance; the other regards it as but the husk and shell and shadow of the reality within.

But with regard to the Eucharistic sacrifice, it is to be considered, that it is not simply the body and blood of Christ, which are believed, or rather imagined, to be respectively in the bread and wine, but our Lord Jesus Christ Himself: and that the sacrifice is not merely of his body and blood in the bread and wine, or in their species, but our very Lord Himself. It is not the body of Christ given for us, which is said to be in, or under the species of, bread, nor the blood of Christ shed for us, which is said to be in, or under the species of, wine: but "whole Christ" in or under both bread and wine: Christ, body and soul, living and glorified: Christ, both God and man.²³²

²³² "Docet sancta Synodus, et aperte ac simpliciter profitetur, in almo sanctæ Eucharistiæ Sacramento, post panis et vini consecrationem, Dominum nostrum, Jesum Christum, verum Deum, atque hominem, vere, realiter, ac substantia-liter, sub specie illarum rerum sensibilium contineri.—Semper hæc fides in Ecclesia Dei fuit, statim post consecrationem, verum Domini nostri corpus, verumque ejus sanguinem sub panis et vini specie una cum ipsius anima et divinitate existere; sed corpus quidem sub specie panis, et sanguinem sub vini specie, ex vi verborum, ipsum autem corpus sub specie vini, et sanguinem sub specie panis, animamque sub utraque, vi naturalis illius connexionis, et concomitantia, qua partes Christi Domini, qui jam ex mortuis resurrexit, non amplius moriturus, inter se copulantur. Divinitatem porro propter admirabilem illam ejus cum corpore, et

"The sacred Synod teaches, and openly and absolutely professes, that in the benign Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, very God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things.—There has always been this faith in the Church of God, that instantly after consecration, the true body of our Lord, and His true blood, together with His soul and Godhead, are under the species of bread and wine: but the body indeed under the species of bread, and the blood under the species of wine, from the force of the words [of consecration]; yet the very body moreover under the species of wine, and the blood under the species of bread, and His soul under each, by the force of that natural connection and concomitance, by which the parts of the Lord Christ, who is now risen from

This doctrine, however, which is called the doctrine of the "Real Presence," has been considered in the former part of this work. It will be sufficient here to observe, that it makes the sacri-

anima hypostaticam unionem. Quapropter verissimum est tantundem sub alterutra specie, atque sub utraque contineri: totus enim et integer Christus sub panis specie, et sub quavis ipsius speciei parte; totus item sub vini specie, et sub ejus partibus existit."—Concil. Trid. Sess. 13, I. iii.

the dead, to die no more, are mutually joined together: and the Godhead, moreover, on account of that wonderful hypostatic union of it with the body and soul. For which reason, it is most true, that He is contained under either species, and under both: for Christ whole and entire is under the species of bread, and under any part of its species: and whole under the species of wine, and under its parts."

"The Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice has its foundation in the truth of the Real Presence. It is grounded upon the same circumstance which has been shown to be characteristic of the Real Presence itself, namely, that Christ is really present because of the presence of His *Body*."—Wilberforce, *Doct. of the Holy Eucharist*, XI. 364.

"If the effect of consecration be to join together the *sacramentum* and the *res sacramenti*, why should persons exclude the one and offer up the other? Why should they exclude the reality or thing signified, and offer up the mere form and shell of the victim? Is not this to be deluded by a system of shadows?—It is to substitute the shadows of the Law for the realities of the Gospel."—*Ibid.* 374, 375. "The Eucharistic Sacrifice is not the offering of the *sacramentum* only, the first fruits of nature, but much more that of the *res sacramenti*, the reality, or thing signified."—*Ibid.* 392. "When our Lord spoke of His Body and Blood as bestowed upon His disciples in this sacrament, He must have been understood to imply that He Himself, Godhead, Soul, and Body, was the gift communicated."—*Id.* c. IV. p. 91. "Our Lord,—the *res sacramenti*, or thing signified."—*Id.* c. V. p. 134 *note*. "At the moment of consecration, Christ unites Himself, Body, Soul, and Divinity, in an ineffable manner, with the Elements of Bread and Wine."—*Tracts for the Day*, No. 5, *The Real Presence*, p. 16.

"Novum instituit Pascha, se ipsum ab Ecclesia per sacerdotes sub signis invisibilibus immolandum.—In divino hoc sacrificio, idem ille Christus continetur et ineruenta immolatur, qui in ara Crucis semel se ipsum cruenta obtulit:—sola offerendi ratione diversa.—Si quis dixerit, in Missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium; aut quod offerri non sit aliud, quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari; anathema sit.—Concil. Trid. Sess. XXII. c. 1, 2, can. 1.

"He instituted the new Passover, Himself to be by the Church through priests immolated under visible signs.—In this divine sacrifice, which is performed in the Mass, that same Christ is contained, and without blood is immolated, who on the altar of the Cross offered Himself once with blood:—the manner of offering being alone different.—If anyone shall say, that in the Mass is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice; or that to be offered is nothing else, but that Christ is given to us to be eaten: let him be anathema."

"Unum itaque et idem sacrificium esse fatemur, et haberi debet, quod in Missa peragitur, et quod in Cruce oblatum est; quemadmodum una et eadem hostia, Christus videlicet Dominus noster, qui seipsum in ara crucis semel tantummodo cruentum immolavit. Neque enim cruenta et ineruenta hostia duæ sunt hostiæ, sed una tantum, cujus sacrificium, postquam Dominus ita præcepit: Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, in Eucharistia quotidie instauratur."—*Cat. Con. Trid.* II. iv. 82.

"We confess that it is, and ought to be esteemed, one and the same sacrifice, which is performed in the Mass, and which was offered on the Cross, as it is one and the same victim, namely, Christ our Lord, who on the altar of the Cross once only immolated Himself with blood,—whose sacrifice is daily renewed in the Eucharist."

In reference to the term "immolated," used by the Council of Trent, I may be reminded, that St. Augustine said: that "he who, when questioned, should answer

fice offered by us in the Eucharist to be our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. And this sacrifice must be either real or imaginary. If it be imaginary, if there be no real sacrifice of our Lord made by us in the Sacrament, there is an end of the question: it becomes a battle of mere words. But if the sacrifice be real, if there be any real and true meaning in the words which express it; then, He that is glorified with the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, suffers in every Eucharist that is celebrated; and He, that is "alive for evermore" is ever dying. The Impassible is ever being slain. The Immortal dies. The doctrine either means this, or it means nothing. The clear and simple

that Christ is immolated, would be telling no lie." But there is a very clear and broad distinction between his use of the word, and the use made of it by the Council. He says:—

Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso, et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes Paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur, nec utique mentitur qui interrogatur eum responderit immolari? Si enim sacramenta quendam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi, sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei, fides est."—Ep. ad Bonifac. XCVIII. § 7 (ed. Benedict, vol. II. p. 400); Ep. XCVIII. Paris, 1841; II. 363, 364.

"Was not Christ once for all immolated in Himself and yet in the sacrament [or sacramentally] not only through all the solemnities of the Passover but every day by [or for] the peoples, and therefore one would not lie if, when questioned, he should answer that He is immolated? For if sacraments had not a certain likeness of those things of which they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all: but from this likeness they generally take the names even of the things themselves. As therefore, after a certain manner, the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, and the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ: so the sacrament of faith is faith."

(That is, a child, though without active faith at the moment of his baptism, may be said to have faith, because he receives the sacrament of faith.) He had also said just before:—

"Nempe sæpe ita loquimur, ut Pascha propinquantē dicamus crastinam vel perendinam Domini passionem, cum ille ante tam multos annos passus sit, nec omnino nisi semel illa passio facta sit. Nempe ipso die dominico dicimus, hodie Dominus resurrexit; cum ex quo resurrexit tot anni transierunt."

"We are accustomed to speak in such a manner, as when the Passover is coming near, to call to-morrow or the next day the Lord's passion, when He suffered so many years before, and that passion has but once at all taken place. And on the very Lord's day itself, we say, The Lord has risen to-day; when so many years have passed since the day on which He did rise."

It is on the same principle, then, on which the annual day of the Passover was called The Lord's passion, and on the Lord's day, we say that the Lord has risen, that we say that Christ is daily immolated, although He was immolated but once.

But the Council of Trent says that Christ is so immolated in the Eucharist as to be a true and proper sacrifice, and that there is no difference between this immolation and the immolation on the cross, but in the manner of offering. Immolation [in the sense of the passage of St. Augustine,] was not truly immolation, but only a likeness and after a certain manner; not the thing of which it is a representation: but in the sense of the Council it is as truly immolation as that of our Lord Himself, and differs not from it in any one thing, but only in the way in which the oblation of that which is immolated is performed.

statement of this doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice conveys, in reality, its own absolute refutation.

Various subtle distinctions may be proposed, in explanation and defence of this doctrine; as that the sacrifice of our Lord is made invisibly under the visible signs, and that without blood: but such distinctions only disprove the doctrine, and show, in utter inconsistency with the anathema, that the oblation made of our Lord in the Eucharist, is not "a true and proper sacrifice."

But the advocates of this doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice are so little affected by the utterly absolute impossibility of really making such a sacrifice, that they, or at least, some of them, maintain a continual offering of our Lord by Himself in heaven. Some learned and eminent persons have lately addressed to the Primate of England a document, in which they solemnly declare their belief, "that, as in heaven Christ, our Great High Priest, ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father, pleading by his Presence his Sacrifice of Himself once offered on the Cross; so on earth, in the Holy Eucharist, that same Body, once for all sacrificed for us, and that same Blood, once for all shed for us, Sacramentally Present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the Priest, as our Lord ordained to be done in Remembrance of Himself, when He instituted the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood."*

The expressions or statements that "Christ ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father"; and that "on earth," his body and blood "are offered—by the Priest"; are susceptible of two interpretations: one, that He offers Himself in intercession, by "pleading—his sacrifice once offered on the Cross"; and that the Priest also offers Him in the same way: the other, that our Lord is ever making a sacrifice of Himself to the Father, immolating Himself; and that his Priests on earth offer Him in the same way. In the former way, there is no real offering or sacrifice of Christ, but the pleading of the one Sacrifice once for all offered: in the latter, there is a "continuous sacrifice" in heaven; not one sacrifice which has a continuous power, but a sacrifice being continually made: and the same sacrifice made also in every Eucharist that is celebrated on earth, as really as it is made in heaven by our Lord Himself, and as it was made by Him on the Cross.

* First Report of the Commissioners on the Rubrics, &c., Ap. pp. 128, 129.

The way of speaking used in this document, has, it must be acknowledged, a kind of authority from extensive and very ancient use: but they who first adopted it, and they who subsequently gave it currency, were careful to explain their meaning to be, not that our Lord again offered, or continued to offer, Himself in sacrifice; but that He continually pleaded his one sacrifice once for all made and finished on the cross. And the offering of Him, which was said to be made in the Eucharist, was understood to be in the same way, a pleading and representing to God of the same one Sacrifice. And this was on the same principle as St. Augustine explained that a sacrament was called by the name of the thing of which it was the sacrament.²³⁵

But it is, nevertheless, an unsafe way of speaking, and has generally come to be understood in the second of the two senses, of which I have shown it to be susceptible.

It may not, indeed, immediately appear, that the Memorialists intended their words in this sense: but this is, certainly, the sense attached to such expressions by the party to which they belong.

We shall call their doctrine, the doctrine of "the continuous sacrifice,"* as some of them have named it. The term itself is, I believe, of but recent date. I can trace it no farther back, than to the Sermons of Archdeacon Manning published in 1850, and the Pastoral Letter of the late Bishop of Exeter in 1851, who, I am confident, could not have read those Sermons: for if he had read them, I cannot think that he would have adopted a term, which might indicate the adoption of the doctrines which they set forth.

Nor can I find that the doctrine itself is of an earlier date than its name. I have not found it either in Aquinas or in Bellarmine. "The Angelic Doctor" says that, "a priest is called *sacerdos*, as giving sacred things," namely instruction in

²³⁵ Aquinas says: "The celebration of this sacrament is said to be an immolation of Christ for two reasons. The first, because, as Augustine says to Simplicius; 'images are wont to be called by the names of those things of which they are images: as when looking at a picture or a painted wall, we say, that is Cicero, and that is Sallust.' But the celebration of this sacrament is a kind of representative image of the passion of Christ, which is His true immolation. And therefore the celebration of this sacrament is called an immolation of Christ.—Duplici ratione celebratio hujus sacramenti dicitur immolatio Christi. Primo quidem, quia sicut dicit August. ad Simplicium: 'Solent imagines earum rerum nominibus appellari, quarum imagines sunt: sicut cum intuentes tabulam aut parietem pictum, dicimus: ille Cicero est, et ille, Sallustius.' Celebratio autem hujus sacramenti imago quedam est representativa passionis Christi, quæ est vera ejus immolatio. Et ideo celebratio hujus sacramenti dicitur Christi immolatio."—3a. q. 83, art. 1, c.

* See Malan, 77, 78, 96, &c.

the Law, the oblation of the people's prayers to God, and a kind of satisfaction for their sins. "Whence the Apostle says to the Hebrews: 'every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins.' Now this most of all agrees with Christ: for by Him divine gifts are bestowed upon men; according to that [saying] of Peter: 'By whom, namely, Christ, He has given unto us exceeding great and precious promises, that thereby ye might be made partakers of a divine nature.' He also has reconciled the human race to God: according to that [saying] in Colossians: 'In Him, namely Christ, it has pleased Him that all fulness should dwell, and by Him to reconcile all things. Wherefore it agrees above all with Christ to be a priest.'²³⁶

In another place, Aquinas says; "In the office of a priest two things may be considered: first, the oblation itself of a sacrifice, and secondly the very consummation of the sacrifice, which indeed, consists in this, that they for whom the sacrifice is offered, obtain the end of the sacrifice. But the end of the sacrifice which Christ has offered, was not temporal goods, but eternal, which we obtain by his death (whence it is said, Heb. ix., 'Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come'), for which reason the priesthood of Christ is said to be eternal. And this consummation of the sacrifice of Christ was prefigured in this very thing, that the High Priest in the Law entered into the Holy of Holies once in the year with the blood of a goat and a calf; as it is said in Leviticus xvi., when yet He did not immolate them in the Holy of Holies, but without. And likewise Christ has entered into the Holy of Holies, that is, into heaven itself: and prepared the way for us to enter, by virtue of His blood, which He shed for us upon earth." And: "Although the passion and death of Christ are not henceforth to be iterated, yet the virtue of that victim once offered endures for ever: because as it is said to the Hebrews,*

²³⁶ "Dicitur sacerdos, quasi sacras dans: secundum illud Malach. ii., Legem requirit ex ore ejus, scilicet sacerdotis: et iterum, In quantum preces populi Deo offert, et pro eorum peccatis Deo aliquiditer satisfacit. Unde Apostolus dicit ad Heb. v., Omnis Pontifex ex hominibus assumptus, pro hominibus constituitur in his quæ sunt ad Deum, ut offerat dona et sacrificia pro peccatis. Hoc autem maxime convenit Christo: nam per Ipsum divina dona hominibus sunt collata: secundum illud 2 Pet. i., Per quem, scilicet Christum, maxima et pretiosa nobis promissa donavit, ut per hoc efficiamini divinæ consortes nature. Ipse etiam humanum genus Deo reconciliavit, secundum illud Colos. i., In Ipso, scilicet Christo, complacuit omnem plenitudinem inhabitari, et per Eum reconciliari omnia. Unde Christo maxime convenit esse sacerdotem."—3a. q. 22, art. 1, c.

* Heb. x. 14.

'by one oblation He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.'—The unity, moreover, of this oblation is figured in the Law, in that the High Priest of the Law entered into the holy place with the usual oblation of blood once in the year: as it is said in Leviticus xvi. But the figure came short of the truth in this, that the victim had not perpetual virtue, and therefore those sacrifices were reiterated every year.²³⁷

And again, he says with Ambrose: "In Christ a victim has been once offered, which has the power of eternal salvation: what, therefore: do we not offer every day? yes, in remembrance of His death.—The sacrifice is one (which Christ, namely, offered, and we offer), and not many, because Christ was once offered.—As the celebration of this sacrament is an image representative of the passion of Christ,—the priest bears the likeness of Christ, in whose person and virtue he pronounces the words for consecration:—and thus in a manner the same is priest and victim."²³⁸

It is clear, then, that Aquinas had no thought of "the continuous sacrifice." He did not think that the eternal priesthood of our Lord required Him to "have somewhat to offer," continually before the Father in heaven. The "divine gifts bestowed" by Him "upon men," the reconciliation of "all things" by Himself; the "consummation of His sacrifice, once for all" offered, and never "to be iterated"; the enduring virtue of that sacrifice for ever, its life-giving power, "perfecting for ever them that are sanctified": these, in his mind,

²³⁷ "In officio sacerdotis duo possunt considerari. Primo quidem ipsa oblatio sacrificii. Secundo, ipsa sacrificii consummatio. Quæ quidem consistit in hoc, quod illi, pro quibus sacrificium offertur, finem sacrificii consequuntur. Finis autem sacrificii quod Christus obtulit, non fuerunt bona temporalia, sed æterna, quæ per ejus mortem adipiscimur (unde dicitur Heb. ix., Quod Christus est assistens Pontifex futurorum bonorum): ratione ejus Christi sacerdotium dicitur esse æternum. Et hæc quidem consummatio sacrificii Christi prefigurabatur in hoc ipso, quod Pontifex legalis semel in anno cum sanguine hirci et vituli intrabat in Sancta sanctorum; ut dicitur Levit. xvi., cum tamen hircum et vitulum non immolaret in Sanctis sanctorum, sed extra. Et similiter Christus in Sancta sanctorum, id est, in ipsum cælum intravit: et nobis viam paravit intrandi, per virtutem sanguinis sui per [?] quem pro nobis in terra effudit.—Licet passio et mors Christi de cætero non sint iteranda, tamen virtus illius hostiæ semel oblata permanet in æternum: quia ut dicitur ad Heb. x., una oblatione consummavit in æternum sanctificatos.—Unitas autem hujus oblationis figurabatur in lege, per quod semel in anno legalis Pontifex cum solenni oblatione sanguinis intrabat in Sancta; ut dicitur Levit. xvi. Sed deficiebat figura a veritate in hoc, quod illa hostia non habebat sempiternam virtutem, et ideo annuatim illæ hostiæ reiterabantur."—3a. q. 22, art. v. c.

²³⁸ Ambr. dicit super Epistolam ad Hebr., "In Christo semel oblata est hostia, ad salutem sempiternam potens.—Quid ergo nos nonne per singulos dies offerimus? ad recordationem mortis ejus.—Una est hostia (quam scilicet Christus obtulit et nos offerimus) et non multe, quia semel oblatus est Christus.—Sicut celebratio hujus sacramenti est imago representativa passionis Christi—per eandem rationem etiam sacerdos gerit imaginem Christi, in ejus persona et virtute verba pronuntiat ad consecrandum.—Et ita quodammodo idem est sacerdos et hostia."—3a. q. 83, art. 1, c.

established the eternal priesthood of Christ. And he thought that from heaven, by priests bearing his likeness, He exercises his priesthood on earth; for it is by his power, and in his person that they serve: so that He is both "priest and victim."

Bellarmino seems to have made some advance beyond the doctrine of Aquinas, in saying that the Priesthood of Christ, being eternal, must be fulfilled in continual offering.

"When Paul says there was no need that Christ should offer himself often, he most plainly speaks of the bloody oblation, which was wholly sufficient, nay of infinite price and value. Other oblations were and are repeated, because they are of finite value. But that it is necessary to the eternal Priesthood of Christ, that He should offer often by Himself, or by His ministers, not indeed in a bloody manner, but in some other way, the same Paul teaches.—For when the Apostle had said that Christ is an High Priest, and minister of the Sanctuary, and Tabernacle, which God pitched, and not man, that is, an High Priest of the Church, not of the synagogue, he adds: 'every High Priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore, it is of necessity, that this Man have somewhat also to offer.' Where you see that Paul concludes, by necessary consequence, that Christ, if He be truly an High Priest, ought to have somewhat to offer, and consequently ought to offer, because every High Priest is ordained to offer. Wherefore, according to the opinion of Paul, Christ is not a Priest for ever, unless He assiduously offer something. Nor is it enough, that He once offered Himself bloodily. The same Apostle afterwards subjoins, declaring that the victim which Christ now assiduously offers, is not anything earthly, as sheep, and oxen, but something heavenly, without doubt the most sacred Eucharist.—Christ who instituted and first celebrated this Sacrament, now also celebrates it daily by His ministers.—That Christ always intercedes in heaven for us, either does not prove that He is a Priest, or proves that He offers now by His ministers. For if our opponents will have it that Christ intercedes by prayer alone, they have no proof from thence that He is properly a Priest:—but if they contend that He intercedes as a Priest, that is, through the offering of a sacrifice; then it is necessary that Christ should always offer; and therefore that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, which is continually offered to God by human ministry." ²³⁹

²³⁹ "Cum Paulus dicit non fuisse opus ut Christus sæpius se offerret, apertissime loquitur de cruenta oblatione, quæ sufficientissima, immo infiniti pretii, et valoris fuit: cæteræ oblationes repetebantur, et repetuntur, quia finiti sunt valoris. Quod autem ad æternum sacerdotium Christi necesse est, ut sæpius offerat per se, vel per suos ministros, non quidem cruenta, sed aliquo alio modo, idem Paulus docet.—Cum enim Apostolus dixisset, Christum esse Pontificem, et ministrum Sanctorum, et tabernaculi quod fixit Deus, et non homo, id est, esse Pontificem Ecclesiæ, non Synagogæ, subjungit, 'Omnis Pontifex ad offerendum munera, et hostias constituitur, unde necesse est, et hunc habere aliquid, quod offerat.' Ubi vides Paulum per necessariam

Here again, in Bellarmine, there is no trace of this doctrine of continuous sacrifice in heaven, no trace of thought that our Lord ever offers there. But when the cardinal allows that if He be an High Priest, He must have somewhat to offer, he distinctly states that though that somewhat is heavenly, it is "without doubt the most sacred Eucharist," which being continually offered to God by his human ministers, is offered by Himself.

Both Bellarmine and Aquinas held that Christ's eternal priesthood necessitates a continual offering by Him: but they had no notion, so far at least as I can ascertain, that the actual offering He had to make was made in heaven. They considered the conditions of his priesthood fulfilled in the Eucharist, celebrated by his ministers upon earth; since in his likeness, and in his person and power it was, that this Hierurgy was performed by them.

I have thought it well worth the while, to exhibit the doctrine of these two great Doctors of the Church of Rome on the office of our Lord as a Priest for ever, in order the better to show the character of this doctrine of the continuous sacrifice. I believe this doctrine, indeed, to be only one of those things in which they who are, consciously or unconsciously, advancing toward the Church of Rome, have, sometimes, logically enough, perhaps, added errors of their own invention to hers; and have urged her on towards completing the fearful edifice of falsehood which she has so long been constructing. Of this the present generation has had evidence, in the great advance of Mariolatry, and in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception; and yet more in the tyrannical and unprincipled imposition, through the so-called Œcumenical Council, lately assembled in Rome, of decrees to establish as articles of necessary

consequentiam colligere, debere Christum, si vere est Pontifex, habere aliquid quod offerat, et consequenter debere offerre, quia omnis Pontifex constituitur ad offerendum. Quare secundum Pauli sententiam, Christus non est Pontifex in æternum, nisi assidue aliquid offerat: nec satis est, quod semel cruento obtulerit seipsum. Subjungit postea idem Apostolus, declarans victimam, quam nunc assidue Christus offert, non esse aliquid terrenum, ut oves, et boves, sed aliquid cœleste, nimirum sacratissimam Eucharistiam.—De efficiente quidem primaria causa, nulla controversia est: constat enim Christum esse, qui et Sacramentum hoc instituit, et primus conficit, et nunc etiam per ministros suos quotidie conficit—Nam si volunt adversarii, Christum intercedere per solam orationem, non habent inde illum esse proprie sacerdotem. Nam quamlibet homo, quantumvis laicus, potest pro alio per orationem intercedere. Si vero contentant illum intercedere ut sacerdotem, id est, mediante oblatione victimæ, tum necesse est Christum semper offerre; et proinde Eucharistiam esse sacrificium, quod a Christo per ministerium humanum Deo jugiter offeratur."—De Missa I. vi. pp. 733, 734; De Sacramento Euch. IV. xvi. 643; De Missa I. vi. 735.

faith, the dogmas of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin into heaven, and of the personal infallibility of the Pope.

I have taken considerable pains to ascertain the history of this doctrine of the continuous sacrifice; and the result of my investigations is, that the doctrine is of only recent growth. In none of our standard divines have I found it: and Waterland, who gives so many distinctions of sacrifice, has no mention of it. I find no nearer approach to it than in the following passages from Field, in his work on the Church, and from Jeremy Taylor, in his "Life of Christ."

Field says: "Christ offereth Himself, and His body once crucified, daily in heaven, and so intercedeth for us; not as giving it in the nature of a gift or present, for He gave Himself to God once, to be holy unto Him for ever; nor in the nature of a sacrifice; for He died once for sin, and rose again never to die any more: but in that He setteth it before the eyes of God His Father, representing it unto Him, and so offering it to His view, to obtain grace and mercy for us. And in this sort we also offer Him daily on the altar, in that, commemorating His death and lively representing His bitter passions endured in His body upon the cross, we offer Him that was once crucified and sacrificed for us on the cross, and all His sufferings, to the view and gracious consideration of the Almighty."*

And Bishop Taylor says: "Since it is necessary that He have something to offer, so long as He is a Priest, and there is no other sacrifice but that of Himself, offered upon the cross,—it follows, that Christ, in heaven, perpetually offers and represents that sacrifice to His heavenly Father, and, in virtue of that, obtains all good things for His Church."—"In virtue of His Cross, He intercedes for us, and represents an eternal Sacrifice in the heavens on our behalf.—There He sits, a High Priest continually, and offers still the same one perfect sacrifice; that is, still represents it as having been once finished and consummate in order to perpetual and never-failing events.—By a daily ministration and intercession, He represents His Sacrifice to God, and offers Himself as sacrificed: so He does upon earth by the ministry of His servants: He is offered to God, that is, He is, by prayers and the Sacrament, represented or 'offered up to God as sacrificed.'"†

* On the Church, Append. Lib. III. Cambridge, 1849, II. 61, 62.

† Worthy Communicant, c. 1, sect. 4; Life of Christ, Disc. xix.; Heb. viii. 3, and x. 12, 14.

Excepting the interpretation here put on the words: "it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer," which shall be noticed in another place; these extracts are fair examples of the opinions of our elder divines on the subject. But they come far short, as will be seen, of the doctrine of the "continuous sacrifice." Field distinctly explains that our Lord's offering of Himself in heaven, is not "in the nature of a gift or present,—nor in the nature of a sacrifice," but that "representing His sacrifice to the Father," He offers "it to His view,"—"and so intercedeth for us." And Taylor also explains his offering to be his representing "the same one perfect sacrifice as having been once finished and consummate."

Take this again from Bishop Cosin: "As Christ Himself, now He is in heaven, does appear in the presence of God for us, making intercession for us, and does present and offer Himself and His death to God; so also the Church upon earth, which is His body, when it beseeches God for His sake and His death, does also represent and offer Him and His death, and consequently that sacrifice which was performed on the cross: for no one is so blind, as not to see the difference between a 'proper offering,' which was once performed by His death upon the cross, and between an 'improper offering,' which is now made either in heaven, by that His appearance on our behalf, or here on earth, by prayers and representation, or obtestation, or commemoration, there being only the same common name for these, but a very wide difference in the things themselves."*

Thus our Lord's offering of Himself continually in heaven, is resolved not into a "proper," but into an "improper sacrifice," between which two things there is "a very wide difference," so wide and great that he must be "blind" who cannot see it: but more "properly" speaking, it is seen to be the intercession of our Lord on our behalf by virtue of his once made, perfect, consummate, and accepted sacrifice of Himself.

Such, I conceive, continued, until lately, to be the doctrine of our leading writers on the Eucharist. It was, of course, variously expressed: as by Bishop Jolly in 1831, saying that our Lord "ever lives, in His mediatorial capacity, to make intercession for us;" that "in the highest heavens, He presents the substance of His body and blood, once offered and slain upon the earth, and which must in heaven remain, until the times of the restitution of all things": where by the

* Tracts for the Times, No. 81, p. 138.

strange expression, "presents the substance of His body and blood," must be meant, "presents Himself," "appears in the presence of God for us": and by this presentation of Himself, once offered and slain upon earth, but now ever living, it was, the Bishop evidently considered, that our Lord made intercession for us.

And the late Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Phillpotts, in 1836, in a charge delivered by him in that year to the Clergy of his Diocese, thus expressed the same doctrine, though apparently making some advance upon it: "In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the commemorative Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ,—the action and suffering of our great High Priest are represented and offered to God on earth, as they are continually by the same High Priest Himself in heaven; the Church on earth doing, after its measure, the same thing as its Head in heaven; Christ in heaven presenting the Sacrifice, and applying it to its purposed end, properly and gloriously; the Church on earth commemoratively and humbly, yet really and effectually, by praying to God (with thanksgiving) in the virtue and merit of that sacrifice which it thus exhibits." And here, it is Christ, not offering Himself, but representing and offering "His action and suffering—presenting the Sacrifice," not offering or making it, which is spoken of. The Bishop does not speak here of our Lord's continuing his sacrifice: and though he spoke, at another time, of the sacrifice being continuous, he spoke of it also as being "ever living," and as "made continuous by the resurrection of our Lord": which is wholly inconsistent with his continuing in the "victim state," with his perpetually offering Himself in sacrifice, and lying, as "the Lamb slain" on an altar in heaven. The bishop must have meant by "continuous sacrifice," a sacrifice of continuous power, not of continuous performance: and, without doubt, would have stoutly maintained, that our Lord's resurrection and "endless life" made a continuance in the victim state wholly impossible.

But Archdeacon Manning* in 1850 was the first that I know of, who started this doctrine of the continuous sacrifice, in anything like the shape in which it is now proclaimed. He said that "the sacrifice of the cross—is continuous," that not only has it "continuous virtue" and "power," but "is as everlasting

* Sermons, iv. 212, 215.

as" the "person" of Christ: and that "His passion is still before the mercy seat." He affirmed that our Lord "now, for ever, offers up Himself in heaven"; that He "truly offers Himself for us perpetually both in heaven and earth:" that He is "evermore offering Himself for us,—not often, but evermore."* He affirmed that our Lord "is now fulfilling the Priest's office of intercession over the blood of atonement 'within the veil':" and that "His intercession is the perpetual presenting of His own sacrifice, that is, of Himself, bearing the wounds of His Passion." † He said that since "the Church is so united to Him as to be one with him," and "as there is but one sacrifice, so there is but one priesthood": that "in heaven and in earth, it is but one act still, one priesthood, and one sacrifice:" and that this is "Christ in heaven, offering Himself in visible presence; and on earth, by His ministering priesthood, offering Himself in the Sacrament of His Body and Blood." ‡ And, lastly, he asserted "that the holy Eucharist is a real and true sacrifice." §

From this, it would seem to be a necessary conclusion, that as the sacrifice on earth is a real and true sacrifice, so the sacrifice which our Lord is "evermore offering" in heaven, is a real and true sacrifice: since they are one and the same sacrifice. And what is meant by this sacrifice, this offering of Himself in heaven, will appear in another place.²⁴⁰

Archdeacon Wilberforce very soon after propounded the same doctrine, in somewhat different phraseology. "Christ," he said, has "offered one perpetual sacrifice for sins":²⁴¹ so that "we have in heaven an abiding sacrifice," a sacrifice "ever living and continuous." But he asserted, that there is a "perpetual and daily offering of it by Christ now in heaven in His everlasting Priesthood": and that "our Great High Priest" now "sacrifices in heaven, and presents His slain humanity before God": yet, that "the offering which was consummated by our Lord's

* Pp. 251, 223, 226, 227. † 215.

‡ 223, 251, 224. § 216.

²⁴⁰ My friend, Professor Swainson, who has most kindly revised this part of my work, has very justly pointed out that "by *continual offering*, Bellarmine meant repeated offerings, repeated masses: Manning by *continuous sacrifice* seems to have meant one sacrifice the offering of which to God was ever proceeding: and that this latter theory excluded all repetition, and therefore also the Romish doctrine of masses."

²⁴¹ So he renders the words in Heb. x. 12: thus not only implicitly determining a grammatical question which is much disputed, but imposing upon them a meaning which they will not justly bear. For admit, as most probably we must admit, that *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* should be joined with *θυσίαν*, and not with *ἐκάθισεν*; we cannot allow that *θ. ε. τ. δ.* will mean "a perpetual sacrifice," a sacrifice which is ever being made: but must maintain that it means "a sacrifice for ever," a sacrifice whose power and effects last for ever.

death,—is perpetuated by His continual intercession.” And he said, that “The Holy Eucharist—is the peculiar act, wherein the effectual intercession, which is exercised in heaven by the Church’s Head, reaches down to this lower sphere of our earthly service”; that “those who minister it here below are only representatives of Him by whom it [the *res sacramenti*] is truly offered”; that “He speaks through their voice,” and “they act by his power.”*

Another, and that a very significant and important step in advance may be here perceived. It had been said before that our Lord “ever offers in heaven”: but here it is said that He now “sacrifices in heaven.” We can hardly take this for a slip of the pen: but if not, it is an extension of the Romanist doctrine of our Lord’s sacrifice in the Eucharist: for the Romanist doctrine is, that He is sacrificed, or sacrifices Himself by the hands of the Priest, in the mass: but I cannot find that it acknowledges any sacrifice of our Lord, or any offering of Himself as a sacrifice, in heaven. The notes in the Douay Bible say that “Christ, as man, continually maketh intercession for us, by representing His passion to the Father:” and on the words: “nor yet that He should offer Himself often,” the comment is, that “this hinders not that He may offer Himself daily in the sacred mysteries in an unbloody manner”: † and this without the slightest allusion to any offering of Himself by our Lord in heaven.

The observations of Bellarmine are also very remarkable. On the words: “Nor yet that he should offer Himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world:” he says: “The sense is; Christ has not entered into heaven by the first oblation of himself, that is, by His death, that he might then go out, and by offering Himself, and dying again enter: and that He should often repeat it, as the Levitical High Priest entered the sanctuary by a victim, and went out, and again entered by another victim and went out: otherwise it behoved Christ to offer Himself for each generation from the beginning of the world, and to suffer death: but by one only oblation, that is, by one only death He has purged the sins of the whole world, and laid open the entrance of heaven to all men.” And again, he says: “By the one death of Christ we are sanctified, nay, we are even perfected, having obtained

* The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, 1853, pp. 350, 351, 353, 351, 364, 358, 351.

† Heb. vii. 25, and ix. 25.

namely, not only remission of sins, but also the ornaments of righteousness, and blessedness itself; and this, for ever, that is, for every age and generation; so that now we need no other Christ, to redeem us by his death; nor that the same Christ should often die for us or for others." Another passage in illustration of this question is too important to be omitted. "The sacrifice of the cross has remitted all sins, past, present, and future: since it obtained a most sufficient price for the sins of the whole world: and therefore that sacrifice having been performed, and sins remitted, there remains not any like oblation for sin, that is, to obtain a price for the remission of sins." But "there has not yet been made remission of all sins: for still there are, and will be to the end of the world, those to whom the price of liberation is to be applied, and sins remitted, and therefore there remains a sacrifice for sin, namely, the sacrifice of the mass."²⁴²

A nearer approach, however, to the continuous sacrifice appears to have been made by Harding, in his controversy with Bishop Jewell. "At the very same instant of time," he said, when "Christ offered and sacrificed His body and Blood" upon earth,—"we must understand that He offered Himself in heaven invisibly (as concerning man) in the sight of his Heavenly Father; and that from that time forward that oblation of Christ in heaven was never intermitted, but continueth always for our atonement with God, and shall without ceasing endure until the end of the world." And "as this oblation and sacrifice of Christ endureth in heaven continually—whereby we understand the virtue of His oblation on the cross ever enduring, not the oblation itself with renewing of pain and sufferance continued; so we do perpetually celebrate this oblation and sacrifice of Christ's very body and blood in the mass, in remembrance of Him." But this

²⁴² "Christus non intravit in cœlum per primam sui oblationem. id est, per mortem suam, ut deinde exeat, et se offerendo et moriendo iterum intret; et hoc sæpius repetat, quemadmodum Pontifex Leviticus per victimam intrabat sanctuarium, et exibat, et rursus iterum per aliam victimam intrabat, et exibat: alioqui oportuisset Christum ab origine mundi pro singulis generationibus se offerre, ac mortem pati; sed unica oblatione, id est, unica morte peccata totius mundi purgavit, et cœlum aditum omnibus hominibus aperuit.—Per unam Christi mortem sanctificati sumus, immo etiam consummati sumus, adepti videlicet non solum remissionem peccatorum, sed etiam ornamenta justitiæ, et ipsam beatitudinem; et hoc in sempiternum, id est, pro omni ætate, et generatione, ut jam non egeamus alio Christo, qui morte sua nos redimat: vel ut idem Christus pro nobis, vel pro aliis sæpius moriatur.—Sacrificium crucis remisit omnia peccata, præterita, præsentia, et futura; siquidem precium acquisivit sufficientissimum pro peccatis totius mundi: et ideo illo sacrificio peracto, et peccatis remissis, non restat ulla similis oblatio pro peccato, id est, pro acquirendo precio ad remissionem peccatorum.—Nondum facta est remissio peccatorum omnium: nam adhuc sunt, et erunt usque ad mundi consummationem, quibus applicandum sit precium liberationis, et remittenda peccata. et ideo remanet hostia pro peccato, nimirum sacrificium Missæ."—De Missa I. xxv. pp. 784, 785.

does not come up to the statement that Christ "ever offers Himself in heaven": and Jewell makes these very just remarks: "where he saith, Christ was thus invisibly sacrificed in heaven, I marvel he saith not likewise that Pilate, Annas, Caiaphas, the soldiers, and the tormentors, were likewise in heaven to make this sacrifice. For without this company Christ's blood was not shed.—But that Christ was—crucified in heaven, I think no man ever saw or said, but M. Harding. The Apostles, the evangelists, the old doctors and ancient fathers never knew it." *

But this doctrine of Archdeacon Wilberforce, that our Lord now "sacrifices in heaven," as indeed that also of those who had said that He "ever offers in heaven," is an addition to the Romanist doctrine, which makes, as it appears, the present offering of our Lord to be upon earth in the mass. So that, as Archdeacon Manning said: "in heaven and in earth, it is but one act still, one priesthood and one sacrifice,—Christ in heaven offering Himself in visible presence; and on earth, by His ministering priesthood, offering Himself in the sacrament of His Body and Blood:" doing, both here and there, the very thing that He did upon the cross,—continuing that one action: the manner only being different, a bloody sacrifice on the cross, but an unbloody sacrifice in earth among men, and in heaven before God. And if that be "a real and true sacrifice" which He offers in the Eucharist in a mystery, what can that be which He is said to offer in heaven, where there are no mysteries? Real, as the sacrifice is said to be in the mass, if our Lord "sacrifices in heaven," it must be in the most real manner it is possible to conceive.

These details in the history of the doctrine of "continuous sacrifice," if I am not mistaken in them, will show how novel it is, and how little the character of Catholicity belongs to it.

But we have yet to trace its present condition. The memorial to the Archbishop has a sequel in a correspondence very ably conducted by the Rev. Wharton B. Marriott with the Rev. T. T. Carter, one of those whose names are appended to it. From Mr. Carter's part of this correspondence I have to present the following abstract. He says that "in heaven, Christ, our Great High Priest, ever offers Himself before the eternal Father," and is "still offering Himself as a sacrifice"; that "He is still to be viewed at the present time as a victim"; and that there

* Works, Parker's Soc. edition, pp. 718, 719.

is "an unceasing continuance or perpetuation of His one offering:" that He is "not merely pleading for us, but ever renewing His oblation of Himself"; and His "intercession—does not rest merely on a past act of sacrifice, but on a continued offering of His own ever-living Sacrifice made once only in the act of Death on the Cross":* that there is "a continuing on, so to say, of the sacrificed position, a presentation of Himself in the Victim State, a prolongation, as it were, of the one act fulfilled on Calvary, though under different circumstances and conditions": that "He is actively engaged as a Victim": but yet He is not "in any sense of the terms [of offering Himself before the Father,] laid as one dying on an altar, as a victim on any altar on earth," nor is "any act being performed similar to the immolation of a victim": for that there is "another mode of offering," in which there is not "any further offering in death, or a bloody sacrifice": that His offering is "without pain;" and "implies no death, no suffering, no immolation, as of a victim laid on an altar to be slain":—that by virtue of his unchangeable Priesthood, "His must be an offering, a sacrifice separate from the ideas of suffering and death":—that "our Lord alone living, though slain, could alone be one continued offering"; that "His continued existence is the ground of His continued offering"; and thus "He has lived on as a victim:"—that He offers Himself "as living"; and "because He ever liveth, His offering ever liveth:" that "having offered Himself in time past in death, He still lives with undying power to continue His offering": and that as He "ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father" in heaven;—so on earth in the Holy Eucharist, that same Body, once for all sacrificed for us, and that same Blood, once for all shed for us, Sacramentally Present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the Priest." †

Contemporaneous with this Memorial, was the publication of a treatise on "the Real Presence" in the "Tracts for the Day—edited by the Rev. Orbey Shipley;" in which the same doctrine appears, with very emphatic assertions that our Lord's "intercession for us—does not mean praying for us or offering up our prayers": that "it is scarcely sufficient to say, that He pleads before God the merits of the One Sacrifice upon the Cross";—that "neither the 'perpetual sacrifice' in heaven, nor the Christian Sacrifice on earth can be adequately represented as

* Pp. 3, 13, 87, 62, 33, 15.

† 33, 92, 12, 13, 11, 84, 63, 32, 33, 37, 38, 13, 37, 62, 102, 3.

an *acted prayer*”; but that “both are to be regarded, most mysteriously but most truly, as a continuation of the One Sacrifice by the One Priest.”*

It might have been considered unfair to describe this doctrine of the continuous sacrifice in my own words: and, therefore, though at some risk of weariness to the reader, I have allowed its propounders to speak for themselves, only bringing together their scattered statements, so as to present them in one view.

But it may be very briefly described as follows. Our Lord Jesus Christ, having offered Himself once for all a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, by his death upon the cross, now lives with undying power to continue his offering, and ever actively offers Himself in one continuous sacrifice, without death or pain, before the Eternal Father in heaven, and also on earth by his ministers in the Eucharist.

Now it is clear, even from the terms of this dogma, that the alleged sacrifice of our Lord in heaven and in the Eucharist is offered in a different way from the sacrifice of the cross. In the sacrifice of the cross his blood was shed, and He suffered death. In the sacrifice in heaven and in the Eucharist, there is neither bloodshedding, nor death. The one was a sacrifice by death, the other sacrifice is by life! How then can there be a continuance of the “victim state”? Surely the “victim state” is a state of death, and to continue in that state is to continue in death. What, indeed, is a victim, but a creature that suffers; and what is a victim in a sacrificial sense, but a creature that suffers death? An “undying victim” must be one that ever lives, and is ever dead or dying: impossible in fact, and self-contradictory in the very words. The nature of things must surely be reversed, before such things could be: and new meanings must be given to words in men’s minds, before they can accept such statements as we have before us.

The intercession of our Lord which He ever lives to make for us, by virtue of his one sacrifice upon the cross, is most expressly distinguished from this continuous sacrifice in heaven. It is by virtue of a sacrifice ever being made, and not of a past sacrifice, that He is said to fulfil his office of Mediator above. Nor is the continuous sacrifice of an undying victim like the living sacrifice of our bodies and of ourselves, which it is the privilege of Christians always to present: for in our sacrifice, there is no victim.

But it will be worth while to examine the foundations on which this doctrine is supposed to rest.

1. The sacrifice of the mass is conceived by Romanists to be necessary to the eternal priesthood of Christ, according to their interpretation of those words: "Every High Priest is ordained to offer both gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer."* They think that our Lord, therefore, needs to be making continual sacrifices, or to be continually sacrificing; or else He would not be a Priest for ever: and this they think also He does upon earth in the mass. They do not perceive or appreciate the alternatives consequent upon this: for either it is a new sacrifice in each mass, different from that of the cross; or it is one and the same, continued for all time. But that it is a new and different sacrifice, they would deny; while if it be one and the same, the condition has been fulfilled in the one sacrifice of which it is alleged that the sacrifice of the mass is a continuation. He had "somewhat to offer," and that "somewhat" He did offer on the cross. The continuance of the one offering is not a fulfilment of the "necessity," any more than its original oblation. The sacrifice was perfect, and the continuance of it would make no difference as to the offering which the function of our Lord's priesthood required.

But the "continuous" doctrine refers to our Lord in heaven this "necessity" of having "somewhat to offer." It represents not only that He is ever offering, but ever offering before the Father in heaven; and not by his Priests only as his representatives, upon earth.

We must, therefore, examine whether the passage of Scripture before us furnishes any authority for this doctrine. "It is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer." The words are read and dealt with, as if Aaron was a priest only during the time that he was engaged in the act of sacrificing, and as if they had declared the necessity of his always having "somewhat to offer," and meant that in all time, from the moment that our Lord was made a Priest, and so long as He remained a Priest, He must be presently offering some sacrifice. But this they clearly do not mean. The necessity is fulfilled to the letter by one sacrifice: and this is testified by the strong disclaimers of belief, that our Lord offers any different sacrifice from that one which was made by Him on the cross.

Neither, again, can it be one sacrifice continued to be made for ever which is meant: for nothing like this is said. It is

* Heb. viii. 3.

“somewhat to offer (*ὁ προσέτευκεν*),” the necessity of which is stated: and when this “somewhat” has been offered, the condition is fulfilled. No more offering is demanded. He is a Priest that has offered it; and if it be sufficient for its purpose, He is “a Priest for ever,” without any more sacrifice, or any prolongation or continuance of his offering. Its power is as enduring, as it was effectual at the first.

The weakness of the sacrifices, that were offered by the Law, necessitated the repetition of these “year by year continually”: but if a “prolongation” and “continuous” offering of the sacrifice of the cross be “of necessity”: then it is, at least in some respects, as impotent as the sacrifices of the Law. Whereas no Christian can doubt, that from the moment our Lord commended his spirit into the Father’s hand, and said “It is finished, yielding up the ghost,” his sacrifice was absolutely perfect, operative, and effectual for ever, for all the purposes for which it was offered. Whatever extent of meaning may be assigned to the word “It has been finished (*τετέλεσται*),” it must comprehend, above all things, that which He was then doing, the sacrifice of Himself. By this last word and act He declared and fulfilled the consummation of his sacrifice. I cannot but express my astonishment, that any could so far overlook the significance of the word, as to say and teach, in effect, that it was not finished; by declaring that “of necessity” the sacrifice must be prolonged, that He must continue in the “victim state,” and “ever offer Himself before the Father.”

But this last necessity is denied in the plainest terms, only a few verses before. Having declared that Jesus “is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing that He ever liveth,”—not as the theory of “continuous sacrifice” would require to be said, “to offer Himself before the Father,” but—“to make intercession for them”: the sacred writer says, that He “needeth not daily, as those High Priests” of the Law, “to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins,”—because He “is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners,”—and then for the people’s: for this He did “once for all (*ἐφάπαξ*), when He offered up Himself.” He offered Himself up for the sins of the people “once for all, when He offered up Himself.”

Again it is said: “For not into holy places made by hands, types of the true, has Christ entered, but into the heaven itself, now to be seen plainly before the face of God for us: nor in order that He should offer Himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy places * every year with blood of others:

* C. ix. 24-28.

for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once at the consummation of the ages hath He appeared for the putting away of sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And inasmuch as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after that judgment, so Christ, having been once offered to bear away the sins of many, shall appear a second time without sin, unto salvation unto them that wait for Him."

Now of the various propositions here laid down, it will be sufficient to draw special notice to these only: namely, that Christ is entered into heaven not to offer Himself often, and that He has been once offered to bear away the sins of many by the sacrifice of Himself. If then He has entered into heaven not to offer Himself often, it follows necessarily, that still less is He there to offer Himself continuously: for a "continuous sacrifice" is a sacrifice so often offered as to be offered without ceasing, to be ever being offered. And if it be admitted, as it is indeed indisputable, that having been once offered He has born away the sins of many, there is then, no cause for a "continuous sacrifice."

If it be said, as it seems to be assumed, that a priest is no longer a priest than he offers gifts and sacrifices, and that therefore our Lord would not be a priest if He did not continue to offer: the argument is false in every way. The priests of the Law were priests, before they had individually offered any sacrifices, or performed any of the functions of their priesthood; and they were priests for life, though they might for years be disabled for their duties. And the Son of God is "consecrated for evermore." He is a Priest: He has offered one sacrifice: and his priesthood imposes no necessity that He should offer sacrifice any more.

Or if it be said, that the place declares the necessity for the time present and future, that our Lord should "have somewhat to offer": the reply is, that the true meaning of the place is quite different. The Greek gives no countenance to the supposition of a reference to present or future oblation. The statement is, of the "necessity" that our Lord should "have somewhat to offer," whatever be the time for its oblation. His priesthood required some oblation, and whensoever that was made, if it were all-sufficient for ever, there was no more necessity for Him to offer.

But not only is it supposed from this place that our Lord for

the time present and future must "have somewhat to offer," and that therefore the oblation must be made in heaven by Himself, and on earth by his ministers: but it is asserted that this "somewhat" is, and can only be, Himself. Mr. Carter says: "Nor is there anything that our Lord can offer, but Himself. There is nothing separate from Himself that He can offer.—What can that 'something' be in His case but Himself, if there be nothing external to Himself that He can offer?"* And to this Bishop Charles Wordsworth well replies, though with some exaggeration: "He has *everything to offer except* Himself, which He has already offered once for all as a Priest, typified by the order of Aaron; everything to offer, *by way of Mediatorial Intercession*, for us, as the Head of the Church which is His body; our Prayers, our Alms, our Confessions, our Praises, and Thanksgivings, above all, our commemorative Eucharists—everything, I say, to *offer* to Godward as a PRIEST—and everything to *give* to usward as a KING." †

This Epistle to the Hebrews, however, has most clearly told us, what it was that our Lord offered, and therefore what it was that, in fulfilment of his Priesthood, He had to offer. "He offered up Himself"; He "offered up Himself without spot to God"; He "was once offered to bear the sins of many"; there was "the offering of his body once for all"; He "offered one sacrifice for sins"; and "by one offering" of that one sacrifice, "He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." "By his own blood," too, "He entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us."

Nor is there any other offering which Christ is anywhere said to make, than that one offering of one sacrifice made by Him once for all.

2. But, Mr. Carter pleads, we have the ritual and worship of heaven itself represented to us by St. John, and there we find the "continuous sacrifice." "In the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain." ‡ "This place," Mr. Carter says, "presumes the victim state, so to speak, still going on. The words added, 'as it had been slain,' guard against the idea of any continued immolation, for they involve the fact of death being past for ever; but the careful preservation of the term, 'The [a] Lamb,' in so marked a way, shows that He is being

* Correspondence with Mr. Marriott, p. 14.

† C. vii. 27; ix. 14, 23; x. 10, 12, 14; ix. 12.

‡ Rev. v. 6.

gazed upon now in heaven as a Person still offering Himself as a Sacrifice." * Now this is acknowledged to be one of "a series of symbolic pictures," but "representing," it is said, "what is now going on in heaven." † That, indeed, it is a "symbolic picture," is true: but that it represents "what is now going on in heaven," is no more true, than that all the other symbolic pictures of that book represent things that are now being done above. And the picture of the "Lamb standing as it had been slain," of a living Lamb bearing the marks of fatal violence, does not bear out the assertion of a continuous sacrifice implied in the words: "That our Lord is being gazed upon now in heaven as a Person still offering Himself as a Sacrifice." Our Lord appeared in his own proper person to the Apostles, and "shewed them his hands and His side." ‡ There was no symbolic immolation here. He showed Himself as Him that had been crucified and slain: but not "still offering Himself as a Sacrifice." There can be no contention, that He was then offering a continuous sacrifice, either in heaven or in earth. He was not sacrificing at all. His sacrifice was past, leaving its marks: and in reality, He talked and walked, and ate and drank, and then ascended: all of which are proofs of a very different condition from a continuation or prolongation of the "victim state." And if when He showed Himself alive bearing the marks of his passion, He was not sacrificing, or offering Himself before the Father in heaven: then, certainly it is not to be concluded from his symbolical appearance as "a Lamb standing as it had been slain," that He is either "being gazed upon now in heaven," or to be regarded on earth, "as a Person still offering Himself as a Sacrifice."

Nor does "the Lamb standing" imply "that He is offering Himself." § He was standing not before an altar, but "in the midst of the throne" and of the creatures that surrounded it: and He was engaged in acts utterly inconsistent with the offering of Himself, then, as a sacrifice. He was not sacrificing when He stood amongst the Apostles, as He that had been dead and was now alive.

3. Again, it is asserted that "the expression of St. Paul, of our Lord '*appearing* in the presence of God *for us*' (Heb. ix. 24) is used in connection with His sacrifice of Himself, and as part of it. It implies that His appearance in heaven in Person is

* Pp. 12, 13.

† P. 33.

‡ John xx. 20.

§ P. 36.

still the manifestation of one actively engaged as a victim for the completion of His redeeming work." * That his appearance in heaven was after his sacrifice, and therefore "in connection with it," we know: but his resurrection, his rising again from the dead to life evermore, is in still nearer connection with his manifestation in heaven. This, if it be a continuation, is a continuation of his resurrection; but most certainly not of his sacrifice. It is a following up of both; but in their order. And "actively engaged," so to speak, He is "in the presence of God,—for the completion of His redeeming work": but there is nothing more than the bare assertion, to prove that it is "as a Victim," and as "still offering Himself as a sacrifice." He is there, certainly, as having been offered, and because He had been offered, and to accomplish the purposes for which He had given Himself: but there is not a word in this place of Scripture to show a continuation of the "Victim state."

4. Another argument for the continuous sacrifice is brought from the law, which required the High Priest, after certain sacrifices, to enter with the blood into the Holy of Holies. This Mr. Carter regards as a continuation of the sacrifice of atonement, and a type requiring fulfilment in a continuous sacrifice by our Lord in the Holiest of all. He says that "the type of the successive High Priests entering the Holy of Holies with the Blood of Atonement, expresses the same truth,—of an ever-present continued offering." † And, moreover, he argues that this "offering of the Blood" being "without suffering," is "an approximation,"—by which he means a type,—"to the offering of our Lord's Person in heaven," without suffering. ‡ He acknowledges, indeed, that "there may seem—a defect in arguing from this great type, because to offer the Blood is not the same as to offer the Person of the Victim. But this," he pleads, "has to be considered—the Blood of our Lord is not now separate from Himself. It is in Him glorified, and is the life of His Person, and cannot be offered except in His Person, and as a part of His person; and to offer His blood is one and the same thing as to offer His very Person. A dead animal victim could not be carried within the Holy of Holies. Death could not enter the Holiest. Only the blood, which might be viewed as in a measure still living, and was the real emblem of life, represented the victim itself. But this is not so with our Lord. He ever lives, and His blood could only be offered,

* P. 12.

† Pp. 14, 13.

‡ P. 37.

as being in Himself. Nor is there anything that our Lord can offer but Himself." *

Now let us see what the type was, in this part of the High Priest's ministry on the day of atonement. A bullock was offered and killed by him to "make atonement for himself and his house": then he was to "cover the mercy-seat" with a cloud of incense, lest he should die from the open vision of the Lord who was to appear in a cloud there; and, taking some of the bullock's blood, he was to sprinkle it before the mercy-seat within the veil. After this, he was to kill one of two goats as a sin-offering to make atonement for the people, and to sprinkle some of its blood likewise upon the mercy-seat. Thus having made atonement for himself and the people, and the holy place itself, he was to come out, and with the blood of both sacrifices make atonement for the altar, and the tabernacle of the congregation. Next, he was to take the other goat, confess on its head "all the iniquities of the children of Israel," and send it away into the wilderness. Then he was to offer a ram for himself and a ram for the people, as burnt-offerings, and make atonement for himself and for them. And lastly, the bullock and the goat, which were the sin-offerings, were carried without the camp and burnt.†

The typical signification of these sacrifices and ceremonies is fully opened out in the Epistle to the Hebrews: but we need not enter into it further than this question of continuous sacrifice is concerned. The holy place was a figure of heaven, in which God appears, not in a cloud, but in the brightness of his glory. The sacrifices and burnt-offerings represent Christ and the shedding of his blood. The scape goat represents Him bearing our sins away, so as to be lost sight of, and remembered no more. The entering of the High Priest into the holy place with the blood of the sin-offerings, represents our Lord entering into heaven by the shedding of his own blood. But He did not enter there to make atonement for the true sanctuary, as the High Priest entered to make atonement even for the Holiest of all the earthly tabernacle: nor yet with fear, to look upon the mercy-seat of heaven; for He went to appear, to be manifested, to be clearly seen (*ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ*) before the face of God, without any cloud to hide his glory. He carried not his own blood as shed, into heaven: He entered in Himself as alive for evermore. There was no atonement re-

* P. 14.

† Lev. xvi. 6, 13, 2, 14, 5, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20-22, 3, 5, 24, 27.

quired for heaven, for its mercy-seat, or for its courts. Therefore He carried in no blood to sprinkle for the reconciliation of anything there. For everything that required it, atonement was made by his blood-shedding upon earth: and by this blood-shedding He "passed through the vail."

Whatever "continuous sacrifice," then, may be imagined in these ceremonies, it can only be of the sin-offerings, the bullock and the goat, with the sacrifice of which the ceremonies of the day commenced. They lay slain, while some of their blood was being carried within the vail, and while the burnt-offerings were being killed, and burnt upon the altar. So likewise, Christ hung upon the cross a continuous sacrifice, so to speak, for the time, while his blood was being shed, and was thus reconciling all things. And when the bodies of the beasts, which had been offered for sin, had been carried without the camp and burnt there, the sacrifice of them was finished and altogether ended. So it was also with the sacrifice of Christ. The type was fulfilled, when his dead body was taken down from the cross and carried away for burial.

Again, the sacrifice was offered and made without the vail. There was no sacrifice made or offered or brought within it, and no sacrifice was continued there. The blood brought within was no sacrifice, but a token or part of a sacrifice, the blood of the sacrifices which had been offered and killed, and were lying without: but it brought and imparted the power of the sacrifices that were without, so as to be effectual within, and to make reconciliation for the holy place, even for the Holy of Holies. And so likewise our Lord's sacrifice was made upon earth. He could make no sacrifice of Himself in heaven, for there is no death there.²⁴³ The shedding and sprinkling of his blood was done upon earth: and since "by the blood of his cross" He hath "reconciled" all things,—whether they be "things in earth, or things in heaven;" insomuch that we "sit together in heavenly places in Him:"* Christ entered through the vail, that is to say, his flesh, not carrying his blood shed into heaven, nor to offer or continue his sacrifice there.²⁴⁴

He was not in the "victim state," He did not make the sacrifice of Himself continuous when He rose from the dead, and while He continued upon earth, forty days, before He went

²⁴³ "Death could not enter the Holiest."—Carter, p. 14.

* Col. i. 20. Eph. ii. 6; i. 20.

²⁴⁴ Mr. Carter says: "The blood of our Lord is not now separate from Himself:" consequently there is no sprinkling of his blood in heaven.

up to heaven: and He went thither, not as a victim, but as having all power in heaven and in earth: not to offer Himself, but to sit on the right hand of the Father.

His sacrifice was finished and altogether ended, when He was taken down from the cross, and was buried. He did not continue sacrificing when He was in the grave. He did not offer Himself as a sacrifice when He rose again. For forty days, He discontinued his sacrifice: and therefore, if He now offers Himself a sacrifice in heaven, it must be a new sacrifice, a sacrifice of Himself over again, or in a totally different sense from all the notions of sacrifice which are to be learned from God's word.

Mr. Carter, however, says that "there is one Victim and one Death, followed by one continued offering of that one Victim":* a position manifestly and absolutely contradicted by the fact, that from the morning of the resurrection to the day of the ascension, there was no offering of our Lord. He was not offering Himself upon earth; nor was He offering Himself in heaven, for He was not ascended thither. There was no prolongation or continuation of his one offering. One Victim there was, and one death: but one death once for all, followed not by a continuance in the victim state, but by endless life.

But Mr. Shipley argues that "If the High Priest had remained in the Holy Place for ever, that one Sacrifice which he carried within the veil would have been a perpetual sacrifice; it would have been always before the Mercy-Seat; no fresh victim need have died; there would have been an ever-enduring atonement before God, for himself and the errors of the people." And from this he concludes that since Christ "entered" heaven, "there to dwell and abide for ever," it was "not to enjoy repose, if we may venture so to speak, after an accomplished and completed work, but to continue that offering which He had begun in the outer court."† It is certainly an amazing supposition, that the continuance of the High Priest of the Law, living or dead, within the veil, would have made the sacrifice, the blood of which he had carried with him, perpetual, and that there would have been no more need of atonement. But he did not remain, nor was he allowed to remain; and it is impossible for man, without presumption, to say, what the effect of his remaining would have been, if God had so ordained, since He has not told us. But Mr. Shipley forgot, that so much

* P. 38.

† The Real Presence, pp. 55, 56.

of the sacrifice as the High Priest carried within the vail did remain there after he went out. It was always before and on the mercy-seat, until the blood of fresh sacrifices was added to it year by year. A continual repetition of such sacrifices was necessary, because they could not take away sin. But the blood of Christ has done this. No repetition of his sacrifice is necessary, nor any continuation or prolongation of it. Once shed, it made reconciliation for ever, not only for those who lived at the moment, but for all from the beginning to the end of the world.

These arguments which I have cited from Mr. Carter, are a fair and impartial specimen of all that he has to say for this doctrine of the "continuous sacrifice": and I think the reader will agree with me that it would be fruitless and tedious to extend further the enquiry into the grounds on which the doctrine is built. But if anyone should be curious to see more, I must refer him to Mr. Marriott's book, of which I have been making use: where, if I mistake not, he will find the weakest and most illogical arguments refuted and disproved with equal cogency and learning by the editor, Mr. Marriott.

And now, one word on the true doctrine. That, indeed, I would hope, is clear from what has been said: but it seems to be, I may say, summed up in these few words of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as before cited according to the Greek: "For not into holy places made with hands, types of the true, has Christ entered, but into the heaven itself, now to be seen plainly before the face of God for us: nor in order that He should offer Himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy places every year with blood of others: for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once at the consummation of the ages hath He appeared for the putting away of sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And inasmuch as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after that judgment, so Christ, having been once offered to bear away the sins of many, shall He appear a second time without sin, unto salvation, unto them that wait for Him." And in these words it is clearly declared, that Christ is "entered into the heaven itself," "not that He should offer Himself often": that, if He were to offer Himself often there, "then must He often have" offered Himself, "since the foundation of the world": and, that if He had offered Himself often, "then must He often have

suffered." But on the contrary, instead of offering and suffering from the foundation of the world, it is declared that "now at the consummation of the ages or dispensations, He has appeared once for the purpose of putting away of sin by the sacrifice of Himself": and so far from making a frequent or repeated offering of Himself, "that as men are once to die, and once to be judged,"—so Christ was once offered: and so effectual is that one offering, that by it He bore "away the sins of many"; and therefore the next time He shall be seen of men, it will be "without sin unto salvation to them that wait for Him."

If words, then, have any meaning, our Lord has entered into heaven not to offer Himself often; nor to offer Himself at all, much less continually, inasmuch as this place of Holy Scripture necessarily implies, that He could not offer Himself without suffering. And if He could not offer Himself without suffering before He came, and that because not having been made flesh, He could not suffer: no more can He offer Himself now that He is entered into heaven, because He cannot suffer because He has "the power of an endless life."

And by his one offering, once made and finished, He has done all that could be supposed to be possible by any imagined "continuous sacrifice." There is no other offering, and no other way of offering, of Himself, for the belief of which there is any warrant of God's word: for to call his incarnation an offering, as Mr. Carter argues, is a mere abuse of words.

CHAPTER IX.

THE TRUE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

It has been shown, as indeed it is self-evident, that the bread and wine in the Eucharist, are not a feast: and it has, I must think, been abundantly demonstrated in the preceding pages, that they are not a sacrifice. If, therefore, the Eucharist be a feast, it is a feast upon some other thing than the elements. But that it is a feast, no rightly-instructed Christian will deny. The whole Church of Christ has ever regarded and celebrated it as a feast: and St. Paul distinctly teaches us to call it by this name.*

What, then, is the subject of the feast? It is that only, which the elements "are," signify, symbolise, and represent. We eat the bread, but partake of the body of Christ; we taste the wine, but drink of the blood of Christ. Upon Him only, upon his body given, and his blood shed, is our feast. We feast upon his sacrifice, and not upon its symbols. And inasmuch as He died once, and death hath no more dominion over Him, and He ever liveth; our feast is, not upon any repetition of His sacrifice, nor any offering of it by us; but upon his one only sacrifice of Himself.

In anticipation and prefiguration of this sacrifice all the sacrifices of the law were appointed, and by it are they all fulfilled. They were offered continually, because they could not take away sin, or "make the comers thereunto perfect": and by the continual repetition of these sacrifices it was shown, that no perfect sacrifice had yet been made. But now no such sacrifices are commanded. No calves or bulls, no he-goats or rams, no lambs or pigeons, no meat-offerings or drink-offerings, no incense, are enjoined. And the absence of all such ordinances testifies that the perfect sacrifice has been made and accepted.²⁴⁵

* 1 Cor. v. 8.

²⁴⁵ Some years ago I met with an observation to which I have lost the reference, that only the legal sacrifices are abolished, and that animals might now be offered in

It is the thankful acknowledgment and commemoration of this which is now alone required: and in this commemoration we offer, as is said by many of the Fathers, not only a reasonable service, but far nobler, and richer sacrifices, than ever fell before the knife of the Jewish priest, or ever he placed upon the altar.

The perfect sacrifice of Christ none but Himself could offer. He laid down his life of Himself, for no man could take it from Him. And as no man could take it, when He said this; neither can any man now take it and offer Him up. I cannot but think that it is either a most dangerous abuse of words, or blasphemy against our Lord Jesus Christ, to speak of offering Him up to God.²⁴⁶ To offer up the Son of God, is to do that which He Himself declared no man could do, and which, therefore, no man ought to pretend to do. I am quite aware that some who use this language really mean by it, only that they plead our Lord's sacrifice before God in their behalf. But why do they use words which signify infinitely more, and thus give countenance to those who do mean almost all that the words plainly express? I would not be uncharitable; but as the effect of a pretension to offer up Christ Himself to the Father, is to magnify the office of those who do so profess: it is possible that they may have a reason in the effect of such language, which they do not feel in its truth.

We have, then, no material sacrifices imposed upon us: neither can we offer such sacrifices with the hope of being acceptable to God. But we have spiritual sacrifices with which we are sure He will be pleased.

What those sacrifices are, has been briefly intimated in various places of the preceding pages: but it will now be well more particularly to consider them as connected with, or involved in, the Eucharist.

Under the law, the sacrifices of things animate or inanimate,

sacrifice to God. But what would be the significance and language of such sacrifices? They would speak the same as the sacrifices of the law, and would be a denial of the perfect sacrifice which has been made: and the offerers would be like those Galatians to whom St. Paul said, "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing" (Gal. v. 2). The sacrifice of Christ would not take away the sins of those who deny it.

²⁴⁶ "None but He could make this oblation of Himself once offered. The representation of it in the sacrifices which were instituted to be the types and memorials of it, mere man, vested with commission from Him to that purpose, might offer. But the real substance, the very flesh and blood of God incarnate, it is the most horrible presumption to think, that any, the most exalted creature, could present to God with acceptance. None but He, who is both God and man in one person, the beloved Son of God, in whom He is well pleased, could offer it, being Himself both Priest and Sacrifice, of infinite merit and value."—Bishop Jolly's *Christian Sacrifice*, c. iii. p. 52, Aberdeen, 1831.

were of no avail with God, beyond "the purifying of the flesh," if they were not accompanied by the spiritual sacrifices of which they were signs. They were signs by which the offerer virtually declared that he had sinned; that he had by sin become guilty of death; that he proposed the life of the victim instead of his own life; and that he trusted, through the mercy of his God, that his sacrifice would be accepted in his stead, and his sins would be forgiven. But if the offerer had no thought of these things, "he that killed an ox, was as if he slew a man,—and he that burned incense, as if he blessed an idol."*

And when we come to commemorate and feast upon the sacrifice of Christ, we also must bring corresponding sacrifices: and if we do not, our Lord's sacrifice will be of no more avail to us, than the carnal sacrifices of the Jews could alone be to them.

As, then, the offerer under the law laid his hand upon the victim, and confessed his sin; so we, taking into our hands the memorial of our Lord's sacrifice, do, by this act, make a like confession. We acknowledge by it that we are sinners, and that by our sins we are guilty of death: according to the argument of St. Paul, "that if one died for all, then have all died."† And the sense of sin and of its great guilt makes the heart troubled: it humbles it and afflicts it with sorrow. This, then, is the first sacrifice with which our receiving the memorials of our Lord's sacrifice, must be accompanied. We offer "the sacrifice of God, a troubled spirit": and we are assured that "a broken and a contrite heart He will not despise."

Secondly, we offer the sacrifice of faith. To partake of the body and blood of Christ, is to avow our belief that He died for us, that by his death He made "a full and perfect sacrifice, propitiation and satisfaction for" our sins: and we signify our trust that God will be pleased to "forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

Thirdly, we make the sacrifice of thanksgiving, which, indeed, in itself, properly embraces the sacrifices of contrition and faith, together with all those other spiritual sacrifices which are or may be made by us in the Holy Communion. For this reason it is most fitly called the Eucharist, the great "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" for God's unspeakable mercy in Christ.

* Isa. lxvi. 3.

† 2 Cor. v. 14.

Fourthly, following up our thanksgiving, there is the offering up of ourselves to God, “of ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto” Him.

Fifthly, we offer up all that we have, to hold it in God’s service, to use it to his glory; with it to honour Him, to help those who are in need, and to give the knowledge of his salvation to all the nations upon earth.

And sixthly, we offer up the sacrifice of prayers, intercessions, and thanks for all men; which St. Paul tells us* “is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour.”

To these spiritual sacrifices we may add material oblations of our substance, for the house and service of God, for the sustentation of his minsters, for the succour of our fellow Christians, and for other “pious and charitable uses.” And as all oblations are signs of spiritual sacrifice, so such oblations for doing good and communicating, are signs of sacrifices which are well pleasing to God.† But they are not themselves sacrifices, neither are they necessarily connected with the Eucharist, or essential to its validity or benefit: for they who have no material oblations to make are as free to come to the Sacrament, as those who give most liberally: and no oblations are required by the Church of England in Communion of the Sick.

The spiritual sacrifices are the true Eucharistic sacrifice. They are comprehended in the whole service of the Eucharist, which, therefore, in this sense is to be called and is a sacrifice. It is a thankful commemoration of the death of Christ, in which, by the breaking of the bread and the pouring out of the wine, we declare our faith to God, that the body of Christ was broken and his blood was shed; and by eating and drinking the symbols of his body and blood, we declare also our faith that his body was given and his blood was shed for us. And we cannot doubt, but must be most certainly assured, that with this sacrifice of faith and thanksgiving, God is well pleased. But as for a sacrifice of the bread and wine in that service, after all that can be said, it is not an actual, and therefore, if a sacrifice, it must be merely an imaginary, sacrifice.

Aquinas well says that the Eucharist has the name of sacrifice “respectu præteriti, in respect of what is past; inasmuch, namely, as it is commemorative of the Lord’s passion, which was a true sacrifice.”²⁴⁷

* 1 Tim. ii. 1-3.

† Heb. xiii. 16. Ps. cxli. 2.

²⁴⁷ “Hoc sacramentum triplicem habet significationem. Unam quidem respectu

And again: "that it is called a sacrifice, in so far as it represents the very passion of Christ."

Some, it may be observed, lastly, have called the sacrifice of the elements a spiritual sacrifice: but this is to give up the sacrifice of the elements themselves altogether, and virtually to transfer the name and reality of the sacrifice to the disposition of the offerer; whose penitence, faith, devotion, and love, are the sacrifice, and not the bread and wine.

præteriti: in quantum scilicet est commemorativum Dominicæ passionis, quæ fuit verum sacrificium."—3a, 73, 4, c.

"Ad tertium dicendum, quod hoc sacramentum dicitur sacrificium, in quantum representat ipsam passionem Christi."—Ibid.

Θύομεν δῆτα τοιγαροῦν τῷ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεῷ
 θυσίαν αἰνέσεως· θύομεν τὸ ἐνθεον καὶ σέμνον
 καὶ ἱεροπρεπῆς θύμα· θύομεν καινῶς, κατὰ
 τὴν καινὴν διαθήκην, τὴν καθαρὰν θυσίαν.
 —καὶ δὴ θυμιῶμεν τὸ προφητικὸν θυμίαμα,
 ἐν παντί τόπῳ προσκομίζοντες αὐτῷ τὸν
 εὐώδη καρπὸν τῆς παναιρέτου θεολογίας, διὰ
 τῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν εὐχῶν ἀναφέροντες·—
 οὐκοῦν καὶ θύομεν, καὶ θυμιῶμεν· τότε
 μὲν τὴν μνήμην τοῦ μεγάλου θύματος, κατὰ
 τὰ πρὸς αὐτοῦ παραδοθέντα μυστήρια ἐπι-
 τελοῦντες, καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας εὐχιστίαν δι'
 εὐσεβῶν ἕκτων τε, καὶ εὐχῶν τῷ Θεῷ
 προσκομίζοντες· τότε δὲ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ὄλωσ
 καθιεροῦντες αὐτῷ, καὶ τῷ γγε Ἀρχιερεῖ
 αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, αὐτῷ σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ ἀνα-
 κείμενοι.—Euseb. Cæs. Demonstr. c. x.

Μηδεὶς ἄξιος τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ
 θύματος καὶ Ἀρχιερέως, ὅστις μὴ πρότερον
 ἑαυτὸν παρέστησε τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν ζῶσαν,
 ἁγίαν, μηδὲ τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν εὐάρεστον
 ἐπεδείξατο, μηδὲ ἔθυσσε τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν αἰ-
 νέσεως καὶ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον, ἢ μόνην
 Ὅ πάντα δοῦς ἀπαιτεῖ παρ' ἡμῶν θυσίαν,
 πῶς ἐμελλον θαρρῆσαι προσφέρειν αὐτῷ τὴν
 ἕξωθεν τὴν τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντί-
 τυπον ἢ πῶς ἱερέως σχῆμα καὶ ὄνομα ὑπο-
 δέσθαι;—Greg. Naz. Orat. ii.; Apol. p.
 56.

"We therefore certainly sacrifice a sacrifice of praise to Him who is God over all: we sacrifice the divine and venerable and sacred sacrifice; we sacrifice in a new way, according to the New Covenant, the pure sacrifice (Ps. l. al. li. 17). And moreover we sacrifice the prophetic oblation, in every place bringing to Him the fragrant fruit of the all-virtuous theology, offering by our prayers to Him.—Therefore we both sacrifice and offer: on the one hand celebrating the memory of the great sacrifice, according to the mysteries delivered from Him, rendering by godly hymns and prayers to God, the service of thanksgiving [or the Eucharist] for our salvation: and on the other hand dedicating ourselves wholly to Him, and to the High Priest His Word, devoting ourselves to Him with body and soul."

"No one is worthy of the great God and sacrifice, and High Priest, who has not first presented himself a living, holy sacrifice to God, nor yielded the reasonable acceptable service, nor has sacrificed to God a sacrifice of praise and a broken spirit, which sacrifice alone He who gives all things requires; how were they to take courage to offer to Him the outward the antitype of the great mysteries? or how assume the fashion and name of a priest?"

CHAPTER X.

ON OBLATIONS IN THE HOLY COMMUNION.

THE question of oblations in the Holy Communion may now be fitly considered: and particularly, whether the bread and wine used in it be themselves an oblation or not.

In the earliest days of the Church at Jerusalem, we are informed that "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common:—and great grace was upon them all; neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the Apostles' feet; and distribution was made to every man according as he had need." * No intimation is given in what way, or with what forms, if any, "the prices of the things that were sold were laid down at the Apostles' feet": or how any of the things which were brought were delivered to the Apostles or distributed by them. But there can be no doubt, that so great liberality to man was exhibited with corresponding devotion to God; and that that which was done so charitably, was also done religiously. The liberality of these Christians was a fruit of the "grace" which "was upon them": and in the dispensation of that grace, love to man is an unfailling proof of love to God: it sprang from that love: and therefore that which was brought for man, would assuredly be offered to God for him: and as they did good and communicated, the faith and grace with which they did this, assured them, that "with such sacrifices God is well pleased." In their own private devotions, therefore, they would beseech the Lord their God to accept them in their offerings: and when those offerings were brought and laid down at the Apostles' feet, the joy of the multitude would find utterance in the Apostles, and through them would ascend in many thanksgivings to God, and in many prayers that He

* Acts iv. 32-35.

would favourably receive the things so presented for the comfort and support of his people.

We know, however, for certain, that it was not long before "the alms for the poor, and other devotions of the people" were thus religiously presented for Divine acceptance, and this in the most solemn assemblies and services of the Church. They were not merely brought to the rulers of the Church, but were by them reverently and formally presented to God. Clement of Rome joins oblations and liturgies together, and says that they ought both to be performed at their appointed times and seasons, in the place and by those that the Lord had directed: and he calls them acceptable and blessed who so offered the oblations. He does not, indeed, specially connect these oblations with the Eucharist; but we may, perhaps, infer that they were connected with it from his expression, "the oblations and liturgies." At all events, it was essentially a Eucharistic service to bring and present oblations in the Church; and it therefore most fitly was joined and associated with that highest Eucharist, by which we celebrate the inestimable gift of our redemption. Love to man was most appropriately shown in that service in which the love of God our Saviour is especially manifested and assured. In this way, and in this connection, it was the custom of all Churches from the beginning, so far as we have any records, to contribute for the relief of the poor, for the "hire" of the labourers in Christ's vineyard, and for the common charges of the Church.

Justin Martyr says: "Such as are in prosperous circumstances, and wish to do so, give what they will, each according to his choice; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who assists the orphans and widows, and such as through sickness, or any other cause, are in want: and to those who are in bonds, and to strangers from afar, and in a word, to all who are in need he is a protector."²⁴⁸ And Irenæus tells us, that "those who have received liberty [from the law] set aside all their possessions for the Lord's purposes, bestowing joyfully and freely, not the less valuable portions of their property; since they have the hope of better things hereafter." And again, as we have seen in another chapter, he repeatedly calls this an oblation to God of "the first-fruits of His creatures." Tertullian also says:

²⁴⁸ Apol. I. 67: Οἱ εὐποροῦντες δὲ καὶ βουλόμενοι, κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δὲ βούλεται δίδωσι· καὶ τὸ συλλεγόμενον ἀποτίθεται, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπικουρεῖ ὀρφανοῦς τε καὶ χήρας, καὶ τοῖς διὰ νόσον, ἢ δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν λειπομένοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐν δεσμοῖς οὖσι, καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδήμοις οὖσι ξένοις, καὶ ἅπλως πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν χρεῖα οὖσι κηδεμῶν γίνεται.

“Everyone offers a moderate contribution of alms monthly, or when he will, and as he will, and as he can: for no one is compelled, but contributes of his own accord. These are as deposits of piety. For from them distribution is made, not for feasts, nor for drinking, nor unthankful eating-houses, but for feeding and burying the poor, and for orphan boys and girls destitute of means and parents, and for aged persons at home, and such as have suffered shipwreck: and if there be any who in the mines, and any who in banishment, or in prison, on account of the way of God, are become foster children of their confession.”²⁴⁹

But there was a still more special connection between the Eucharist and these “devotions of the people.” The offerings were of various kinds: chiefly of money, and of bread and wine; and of the oblations of bread and wine, part was consumed in a frugal meal called Agape, or a feast of charity, either before or after the celebration of the Eucharist,—for authorities differ about this: and part was reserved for the Sacrament itself. Of this we have proof in the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. And Tertullian writes: “About the modest supper-room of the Christians alone a great ado is made. Our feast explains itself by its name. The Greeks call it love. Whatever it costs, our outlay in the name of piety is gain, since with the good things of the feast we benefit the needy.—As it is an act of religious service, it permits no violence or immodesty. The participants, before sitting down, taste first of prayer to God. As much is eaten as satisfies the cravings of hunger, as much is drunk as befits the chaste.”²⁵⁰

And the remonstrance of Cyprian with a rich woman: “Think you, that you celebrate the Lord’s [feast,] who do not at all regard the oblation; who come into the Lord’s [house] without

²⁴⁹ “Modicam unusquisque stipem menstrua die, vel quum velit, et si modo velit, et si modo possit, apponit: nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert. Hæc quasi deposita pietatis sunt. Nam inde non epulis, nec potaculis, nec ingratis voratrinis dispensatur, sed egenis alendis humanisque, et pueris ac puellis re ac parentibus destitutis, jamque domesticis senibus, item naufragis: et si qui in metallis, et si qui in insulis vel in custodiis, ex causa Dei sectæ, alumni confessionis suæ fiunt.”—Apol. c. xxxix.

²⁵⁰ “Cœna nostra de nomine rationem sui ostendit: id vocatur ἀγάπη, quod dilectio penes Grecos. Quamviscumque sumptibus constet, lucrum est pietatis nomine facere sumptum. Siquidem inopes refrigerio isto juvamus. . . . Nihil vilitatis, nihil immodestię admittit. Non prius discumbitur, quam oratio ad Deum prægustetur. Editur quantum esurientes cupiunt: bibitur, pudicis est utile. Ita saturantur, ut qui meminerint etiam per noctem adorandum Deum sibi esse. Ita fabulantur, ut qui sciant Dominum audire. Post aquam manualement et lumina, ut quisque de Scripturis Sanctis vel de proprio ingenio potest, provocatur in medium Deo canere; huic probatur, quomodo biberit. Æque oratio convivium dirimit: inde disceditur non in catervas cœsionum, neque in classes discursationum, nec in eruptiones lasciviarum, sed ad eandem curam modestię et pudicitię; ut qui non tam cœnam cœnaverint, quam disciplinam.”—Apol. c. xxxix.

a sacrifice : who takest part of the sacrifice, which the poor man has offered ?”²⁵¹ while it shows that the oblations were called sacrifices by Cyprian, shows also that the Lord’s feast had for its elements, on that occasion at least, oblations or sacrifices made by the poor. Chrysostom also says : “ All the faithful being come together after the hearing of the doctrine, after the prayers, after the communion of the mysteries, the communion being over, did not forthwith depart to their homes, but the rich and the more prosperous, having brought from their homes nourishment and victuals, invited the poor, and set tables for them in common, and had a common feast of meat and drink in the Church itself.”

The Agape and the Eucharist were furnished from the common offerings of the people : there were no endowments by which either could have been supplied. And they were both celebrated, though, perhaps, not always, at the same meeting.

It would hardly be thought by any, that the whole quantity of bread and wine, brought at any one time, would be placed upon the holy table. If any was placed there at the beginning of the service, or before the consecration, it would, most probably, be that portion only which, while it might serve as a memorial of the general oblations, was also intended for the Sacrament. Now the most ancient uninspired record we have of the celebration of the Eucharist, cited before from Justin Martyr, informs us that “ Bread and a cup of water and wine are brought to the President of the Brethren. And he, having taken them, sends up praise and glory to the Father of all through the name of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.— And after the giving of thanks by the President, and the loud assent of all the people, they who with us are called deacons give to each of those present to partake of the consecrated bread and wine and water.”²⁵²

When, therefore, the elements were thus brought to the “ President,” he would naturally, and, indeed, we might say, necessarily, put them upon the table ; though he might retain a portion of them in his hands, while he was giving thanks. But we do not find anything like an oblation of them, separately

²⁵¹ “ Locuples et dives es, et Dominicum celebrare te credis, quæ carbonam omnino non respicis ; quæ in Dominicum sine sacrificio venis ; quæ partem de sacrificio, quod pauper obtulit, sumis ?”—De Op. et Eleemos.

²⁵² Συνιόντες οἱ πιστοὶ πάντες μετὰ τὴν τῆς διδασκαλίας ἀκρόασιν, μετὰ τὰς εὐχὰς, μετὰ τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνίαν, τῆς συνάξεως λυθείσης, οὐκ ἀνεχώρουν εὐθέως ὁκάδε, ἀλλ’ οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ εὐπωρότεροι φέροντες οἰκοθεν τροφὰς καὶ ἐδέσματα, τοὺς πένητας ἐκάλουν, καὶ κοινὰς ἐποιοῦντο τραπέζας, κοινὰς ἐστίασεις, κοινὰ συμπόσια ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.—Hom. liv. tom. v. p. 365.

from the other oblations, and as a part of the sacramental service. And even in the middle of the fourth century, we do not find any traces of such an oblation, in the account of the Eucharist by Cyril of Jerusalem. He only says, that they called "upon the merciful God to send forth His Holy Spirit upon the [gifts] lying" on the holy table.²⁵³

There was then, first, an offering of bread and wine, of money, as it might be, and of whatsoever was needed for the common purposes of the Church. And this act of oblation was essentially distinct from the Sacrament: it had no necessary connection with it, except that bread and wine, whensoever, and by whomsoever supplied, were necessary for the Sacrament. And of the bread and wine, once offered in common with other things, part was afterwards used for the Sacrament. There was, therefore, a connection of convenience in it with the act of oblation; but no more.

Whatsoever names, consequently, have been given to the act itself or to the things offered;—whether, gifts, oblation, or sacrifice;—they do not, in reality, touch the essence of the Sacrament. The oblation of the elements is not necessary to its validity. There is not the shadow of an oblation of them in the Communion of the Sick in the Church of England; and I suppose it will be allowed, at least by Churchmen, that it is a valid Sacrament.

Secondly, if, as has been intimated, the general oblation was made with the form of putting part of the things offered, as a memorial upon the altar; and if, as would in such case be most probable, it was with this very portion of the bread and wine which had been offered, that the Holy Communion was celebrated:—still it must be seen that the connection between the act of oblation and the Sacrament did not even thus become necessary. We must not on this point, suffer ourselves to be carried away by the piety, the beauty, or the instructive character of such an oblation of our substance; or by the fitness of conjoining it with our highest oblations and praise in the Eucharist; or by the very appropriate and naturally dictated use of the memorial of the oblations on the altar for the

²⁵³ τὰ προκείμενα scil. δῶρα. I conceive that the bread and wine were called by this name, in the meaning that they were, not gifts to God, but gifts from God: and this, first, because they were considered, as Irenæus says, the first-fruits of God's gifts in his creatures: and secondly, because in the Sacrament we receive them from God as "the rational [or spiritual] and mystical gift" of the body and blood of Christ.—*ἐρέυνα τὸ συνεδδς. καὶ τότε δέχου τὸ δῶρον.—τὸ νοερὸν καὶ μυστικὸν δῶρον.* Theodoret in 1 Cor. xi.; Chrysost. in Ps. xcvi. The Liturgy of St. Mark has τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν δῶρων προεθήκαμεν ἐνωπιὸν σου.

purpose of the Sacrament itself. We may do full and hearty homage to all this. But notwithstanding all that can be said in this way, and all that might readily be allowed, on this subject; we must not turn an accidental into an essential part of the Sacrament. Rites, ceremonies, and forms, which very fitly and piously, consistently with sound doctrine, and as aids to devotion, may be used in the service in which the Sacrament is celebrated, are not, therefore, even if very ancient and general, to be counted as essential to it. They may be varied or omitted, as the Church may direct: and so the different Churches of Christendom, with more or less judgment and fidelity to Christian truth, have, in fact, done. The rites, which, in any part, or in the whole of the Church, may precede, or introduce, may accompany or follow the celebration of the Sacrament,—how worthy soever they may be of it, and calculated to do honour to it, or even to add to its solemnity,—if we might dare to imagine that anything can add solemnity to a mystery so awful and so holy;—these are not to be intruded into the essence of the Sacrament, nor ought they to be allowed to confuse our apprehensions of it.

It is to no purpose to show that bread and wine were used in the sacrifices of the Old Testament; or to allege that, in certain cases, they might have been sacrifices by themselves: for this, as we have seen, they were not; and the fitness of anything for a sacrifice under the Old Testament, does not prove that it is a sacrifice under the New. It is to no more purpose to say that the elements are an oblation in the necessary rites of the Sacrament, because they were offered in common with other things for the use of the Church; for this is only to turn the connection of accident and convenience, which has been pointed out, into a necessity. Nor is it to any purpose to bring hosts of passages from writers up to a very early date, proving that the elements were regarded as an oblation, or even a sacrifice, and that the offering of them as an oblation or a sacrifice is a necessary part of the Eucharist: for this is to build without that foundation, without which no doctrine can stand, the testimony of the earliest, and above all, of the inspired authorities.

In the actual practice of the Church all over the world from the beginning to the present time, the elements, although they may be, and sometimes are, offered in common with other things, and although they came to be made an oblation by themselves, are not sacrificed. The Liturgy, it is true, which is called by

the name of St. Chrysostom, directs the priest to thrust "the holy spear" into the oblation, and to "slay": but this is merely a representation and not the reality of a sacrifice. Nor is there any command in the New Testament, or any circumstance in the institution to sanction the doctrine of an oblation, any more than of a sacrifice, of the elements. The Divine records tell us that "The Lord Jesus, the same night that He was betrayed, as they were eating, took the bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup when He had supped, and gave thanks, and gave it to them saying, Drink ye all of this: for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins." But what traces can be here discovered of any sacrifice or oblation, save of that one sacrifice and oblation of the Lord Himself? "As they were eating, Jesus took," not any or some bread, but "the bread," the bread, assuredly, which they had been eating with the Paschal lamb. "After the same manner also He took the cup when He had supped," the cup from which they had been drinking before. Dare we be so bold as to intrude here a sacrifice or an oblation of the bread and wine? Does St. Paul record any sacrifice or oblation of them, or any command so to offer them? Or is there any sacrifice or oblation of them necessarily or even incidentally to be implied? A sacrificial feast it was, which our Lord and his Apostles were keeping. But, as has been represented, the bread and wine were not the sacrifice, nor a part of it, nor yet an oblation. They were but an adjunct, though the bread was a prescribed adjunct, to the feast upon the lamb that had been slain. The bread and wine of which our Lord and the twelve were thus partaking, He took and exalted to a more spiritual and heavenly use. He made them neither sacrifice nor oblation, but his own body and blood, symbols of the one sacrifice offered once for all; one which it seems not too much to say, He Himself could not either continue or repeat.

The bread and wine were on the table for the Paschal supper, and were neither a sacrifice nor an oblation. But of what avail would it be even to prove incontestably that they had been previously sacrificed, or had been conjoined with the sacrificing of the lamb, or had been offered upon the altar? We cannot renew the Jewish Passover, in order that the bread and wine should be on the table in the same way and in the same character.

We cannot understand our Lord as implying that we must perform a Jewish sacrifice, as a necessary introduction to the commemoration of his own. Nay, "Christ our Passover has been sacrificed for us": and it is only in connection with that sacrifice, and consequent upon it, that we can rightly "keep the" Eucharistic "feast."

The placing of the elements upon the table was no part of the Christian service: for they were there before our Lord began his Eucharist. "Jesus took the bread,—and in like manner also took the cup," the bread and the cup, namely, which had been provided and used for the Paschal Supper. They were there in connection with a Jewish sacrifice: He has given them to us in connection with his own. So also it was especially revealed to St. Paul, "that the Lord Jesus took bread," and "after the same manner also He took the cup": and the only sacrifice or oblation he sets forth here, is the body of Christ which was broken, and the cup of the New Testament in his blood. Surely if such a sacrifice or oblation as that of the bread and wine had been made, or intended to be perpetuated, it would not have been left, according to the arguments of those who would persuade us that it was intended, as at best only to be gathered by remote and by no means necessary implication.

As, therefore, we do not find in the Divine records of the institution by our Lord Himself, or in the revelation made of it to St. Paul, any traces of a sacrifice or oblation of the bread and wine as the elements of the Sacrament: so do we find a like absence of the sacrifice or oblation of them in that character in the earliest age of the Church. Justin Martyr, as we have seen, thus describes the ceremony: "Bread and a cup of water, and of mixed wine are brought to the President,—and he having taken them, sends up praise and glory to the Father of all, and makes thanksgiving at great length." The description is, indeed, brief: but if there had been a sacrifice or oblation of the bread and wine, Justin would, most certainly, not have neglected to mention it; at least, if it had been a necessary part of the Sacrament. So, too, in the very particular and detailed account of the celebration given by Cyril of Jerusalem, more than two hundred years after Justin, we find precisely the same absence of all mention of a sacrifice or of a separate oblation of the elements. The accounts of these two Fathers correspond most exactly to those which the Divine records give.

If, then, we apply the golden rule of Vincent of Lerins, "quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est: that which everywhere, that which always, that which by all is believed," is "truly and properly Catholic": we must see clearly that the doctrine of a material sacrifice or oblation, of the sacrifice or oblation of the bread and wine as the elements of the Eucharist, is as little Catholic, as it is scriptural. Though it were proved to be strictly universal in subsequent ages, it would be deficient in the chief elements of Catholicity, a foundation in God's most holy word, and in the doctrine and practice of the Church from the beginning. The proof of Catholicity is deficient in its most vital part, if it does not embrace the suffrages of the first centuries, if it does not run on from the beginning; and above all, if it does not clearly include those first and best of all the Fathers, the writers of the New Testament. This is the one indispensable foundation of Catholic truth. Things indifferent come under one category, doctrine under another: and while in the former the Church has a large liberty, so that "all things be done decently and in order," in charity and to edification: in matters of doctrine, all must spring out of holy Scripture, and have witness from the beginning.

Whereas it has become the fashion with a party in the Church to esteem and call things Catholic, if their antiquity reach back only a few hundred years: a fashion by which great injury is done to Catholic truth, and the belief and practice of things which are truly Catholic has been greatly hindered.

We see, then, that according to the institution of our Lord Jesus Christ, and according to the original practice of his Church, there is no oblation of the bread and wine as the elements of the Eucharist. He has simply commanded them to be taken and received. They must be present, that the priest may do with them, as the Lord Himself did: but the time when they are to be placed upon the altar, or the manner how, is neither expressed nor intimated. It is only necessarily implied that they are to be ready, in order that the priest may take them, and give thanks. They may form part of a larger oblation: they may be the memorial by which that oblation, "laid," as related in the Acts of the Apostles, at the "feet" of "the President," has been solemnly presented before God: they may be placed on the altar at any part of the service previous to the offering of our praises and thanksgivings: these are

things which the Church or every branch of it has a clear right to determine for itself. Somewhere and somehow the elements for the Sacrament are to be set forth. They are to be ready; and provided only that it be decently, and in order, and to edification, the particular time and manner of their proposition may be varied by the competent authority of the Church.

Our own Church directs after "the alms for the poor and other devotions of the people" shall have been "reverently" brought "to the Priest," and "humbly" presented and placed by him "on the holy Table," that he "shall then place upon the Table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient" for the number of communicants.

But whether the elements are intended to be an oblation or not is a question which admits of some argument. It may be stated, that in that part of the prayer for the Church militant: "We humbly beseech Thee most mercifully to accept our alms and oblations, and to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty"; the word "oblations" comprehends the bread and wine just placed on the Table. But it cannot be maintained that it must comprehend them: for the sentences of the offertory show that, besides the alms for the poor, there may be offerings for the general purposes of the Church, especially for the Clergy, which would all come under the name of oblations:²⁵⁴ and these may be the only oblations made at any particular time; as when a collection is made for some special purpose exclusive of the poor, and the Holy Communion is not to be celebrated. Such offerings, therefore, may be the oblations, and the only oblations at the time.

And then, if such offerings be oblations in the meaning of the prayer, as it cannot be questioned but they are; and if they be made, when the Sacrament also is to be ministered, the bread and wine, if they be an oblation, are an oblation in common with them, and only in common with them, so far as the prayer goes. They are, in this case, not strictly a sacramental oblation.

It must be noticed, moreover, that the Rubric is somewhat inconsistent with the theory, that the Church of England regards, or intends that her members should regard, the elements of the Eucharist as an oblation. The Rubric seems to make a very marked distinction between the presentation of the alms and other devotions of the people, and of the bread

²⁵⁴ In the Scotch Liturgy of Laud, "the devotions of the people" are distinctly called oblations. So also are they called in Wren's Orders.—Cardwell's Doc. Annals, ii. 205.

and wine. It directs that the persons who shall have received the former shall "reverently" bring the "bason" containing them "to the Priest," and that he "shall humbly present and place it upon the Holy Table": while it simply says that "when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient." He "shall humbly present and place" the bason "upon the Holy Table": he "shall place upon the Table" the "bread and wine": this seems to make the presentation of the alms a much more solemn thing than the placing of the elements; which is somewhat inconsistent with the theory of the latter being an oblation; these being merely placed, the bason being reverently brought and humbly presented and placed.

The Rubric also says: "When there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much bread and wine": but the Rubric in the prayer says: "If there be no alms or oblations, then shall the words [of accepting our alms and oblations] be left out unsaid:" from both of which Rubrics it may be concluded that the bread and wine may be on the Table, and that there may, nevertheless, be no alms or oblations. And if this conclusion be correct, it would prove that our Church does not intend an oblation of the bread and wine.

Again; the Rubric after the offertory sentences speaks of "the alms for the poor, and other devotions of the people": and in the prayer following, we beseech God "to accept our alms and oblations." And in each of these places, "alms" certainly means neither more nor less than the same thing: while "the other devotions of the people" in the Rubric corresponds to the "oblations" of the prayer, and does not include the bread and wine. The "devotions" and the elements are distinct from each other. Are they both, then, included together under the name of "oblations" in the prayer? The parallelism between the two places would seem to be a proof, at least a presumptive proof, of the negative: to exclude the elements from the "oblations," and to make the "oblations" comprehend only "the devotions of the people." And "devotions," things devoted, is certainly coextensive in meaning with "oblations," things offered or given to be offered. But if "oblations" has a larger meaning, and comprehends the bread and wine as well as the devotions, there would still be no sacramental oblation of the elements: for both would then be offered only in common.

A positive decision of this question can, perhaps, only be

arrived at from the intention of the Church. But this, again, may be doubtful. We know, indeed, certainly, first, that the Roman Missal had, as it still has, an express verbal oblation of the elements; and secondly, that our first reformed Prayer Book, commonly called the First Book of Edward the Sixth, altogether omits this oblation. It only directs the "minister" to "take so much Bread and Wine, as shall suffice—laying the bread upon the corporas, or else in the paten, or in some other comely thing prepared for that purpose:" and to put "the wine into the chalice, or else in some fair or convenient cup"; and to set both "the bread and wine upon the Altar": it makes no mention whatever of oblations in the prayer "for the whole state of Christ's Church": and it only refers to the elements in the prayer of consecration as "gifts" of God:—"with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine": and: "we thy humble servants do celebrate, and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make." There is, in fact, a most careful avoidance of everything like an oblation of the bread and wine.

The Second Book of Edward the Sixth has a clause, praying God "to accept our alms and to receive these our prayers": and so it continued till the last review, from which we have our present Book of Common Prayer. In it we first find the mention of oblations as made in the Holy Communion:—"we humbly beseech Thee most mercifully to accept our alms and oblations, and to receive these our prayers." And it is sometimes contested, that the word was then inserted with the intention of restoring the doctrine and practice of the oblation of the elements. But there is one fact which appears to me a complete answer to this; namely, that it was proposed to assimilate the Rubric to that of the Scotch Prayer Book, which directs "the presbyter" to "offer up, and place the bread and wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's table": but the proposal was rejected.*

It is, therefore, surely, not too much to infer, that it could not be the intention to make an oblation of the bread and wine. If it were the intention, it is by no means obvious or avowed. And I cannot but think that if it were the intention, and if the oblation were believed to be either an important or an

* Cardwell's History of the Conferences, viii., 1840, 390.

essential rite in the celebration of the Sacrament; the intention would have been made clear, and the oblation would have been distinctly and directly enjoined, and would not have been left to mere conjecture, or to uncertain and disputable implication.

It is, moreover, to be remembered, that, as is so often the case, there may be no "other devotions of the people" than "the alms": and then, if there be not "a communion," the words "alms and oblations" are, nevertheless, both to be said in the prayer: for the Rubric directs: "if there be no alms or oblations, then shall the words [*of accepting our alms and oblations*] be left out unsaid." Which, meaning clearly, that, if there be neither "alms"—nor—"oblations," the words are not to be said; mean, also, conversely, that if there be "alms" but no "oblations"; or if there be "oblations," but no "alms," both the words "alms and oblations" are to be said in each case. When, therefore, there are "alms," but no "oblations," the "alms and oblations" of the prayer will mean the "alms" only: and this is sufficiently in accord with the doctrine of the Church: for such "devotions" as are "for the poor," may be rightly called by both names; because, while, as regards men, they are "alms," they are "oblations" as regards God.

But if there be "a communion," there must be also alms, as the Rubric directs. And then the "alms and oblations" of the prayer may comprehend the bread and wine, which the Priest is to "place upon the Table." Yet, in this case, which is the usual one, the bread and wine are "oblations," only in common with the alms: and they will thus, the alms and the bread and wine, correspond to the oblations of the Church in the time of the apostles.

It must not, however, be forgotten, as one essential element in this enquiry, that in the disuse of the Missal, and the establishment of the Book of Common Prayer, the intention of the Church of England was to restore "the godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers":* and consequently to reinstate the doctrine and practice of the primitive Church, with regard to the Eucharist, in all essential and ascertainable points. This doctrine and practice has been shown on oblation and sacrifice. We have ascertained, that in the first ages of the Church, no sacrifice of the bread and wine was imagined, nor any oblation of them by themselves as the elements. In after

* Concerning the Service of the Church.

ages they were regarded not only as an oblation, but as a sacrifice. And it is somewhat instructive to mark, how from being merely an oblation for the uses and needs of the Church, in common with other things, as money, victuals, clothing for the poor, or garments for the clergy, the bread and wine after some considerable time, were ultimately exalted into the very sacrifice of our Lord Himself. First, we hear of the devotion by believers of all their "possessions and goods," their bringing the prices of "lands and houses," their laying down the money "at the apostles' feet," their mutual communication of "all things," and the "distribution" by the apostles "unto every man according as he had need."* Then we find a "collection for the saints—on the first day of the week."† And in neither case can it be doubted, that all this liberality was exhibited with humble devotion; that it was done with the "reasonable sacrifice" of the givers themselves, and "to the glory of their Lord": that the offerings, in fact, were religiously made when the body of believers were "come together in one place," especially when they assembled on the first day of the week "to break bread." And we find that St. Paul brought "alms and offerings" from the Gentiles for his nation to Jerusalem; which offerings, it seems to me, we must, from the word itself, necessarily understand as contributions solemnly offered for the purpose, and presented to God with prayer. But in all this, we find no oblation, much less sacrifice, of the bread and wine as the elements of the Eucharist. We find no sacrifices but spiritual sacrifices: nor any oblations but for the poor, for the saints, and for the various exigencies of the Church. All were offered together in common: one act of oblation was for all.

In the apostolic age, Clement of Rome speaks of oblations, and of the offering of gifts, and these with liturgies. It may, perhaps, be thought that Clement must have had some higher oblations in his mind, when he called our Lord the High Priest of our oblations, and maintained the position of "Bishops who blamelessly and holily offered" them. But the reply is sufficient, that the oblations in common were an expression of love to God and man, and especially of thankfulness for his salvation; and also included the bread and wine which were to be employed in the Eucharist. The "oblations" of this very early and apostolical Father are evidently the same as those,

* Acts ii. 45; iv. 34, 35; ii. 44; vi. 1, 2; iv. 35.

† 1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 5, 19; 1 Cor. xi. 20; Acts xx. 7.

of which we find traces in the New Testament, and nothing more.

An advance may be imagined in the language of the Ignatian Epistles, which several times speak of the Christian altar. But such expressions as: "He who is within the altar," cannot, without violence, be applied to a material altar: and the oblations of Christians imply an altar, as much as the supposed sacrifice of the elements. And the altar implies oblations, but not necessarily sacrifice. So that there really is no advance in the language of these Epistles beyond that of Clement and of the New Testament.

Justin Martyr appears to call "the bread and cup of the Eucharist" by the name of sacrifice, while yet he in reality refuses to give them that name.

Irenæus calls the elements an oblation, but as of first-fruits, not as the elements for the Eucharist.

And in Tertullian we do not find any proof that he regarded the bread and wine of this Sacrament as either sacrifice or oblation.

Origen speaks of the rendering of first-fruits to God, for the priests of the Gospel.

Cyprian speaks of the offering of the cup,²⁵⁵ as one of the elements of the Sacrament: and, of course, he regarded the bread as an oblation with it. He gives the name of sacrifice to the general oblations, including the elements: speaks of the whole service as the celebration of the sacrifices of God: and says that we celebrate the Lord's sacrifice, when our oblation and sacrifice answer to his passion.²⁵⁶

Jerome seems to call "the bread and wine a simple and pure sacrifice."²⁵⁷

So also does Augustine seem to call them a sacrifice, as being, or as signifying, the body and blood of Christ; but not as the bare elements; not a true sacrifice, but a memorial of the sacrifice of Christ.²⁵⁸

So also Chrysostom says: "We offer indeed, but making a

²⁵⁵ "In calice offerendo."

²⁵⁶ "Dominicum celebrare te credis,—quæ in Dominicum sine sacrificio venis, quæ partem de sacrificio quod pauper obtulit, sumis?" "Sacrificia Dei quotidie celebramus."—"Nec sacrificium Dominicum legitima sanctificatione celebrari, nisi oblatio et sacrificium nostrum respondeat passioni."—Ep. lxiii. 1; De Opere et Eleemosynis; Ep. liii. al. lvii.; Ep. lxiii. 6.

²⁵⁷ "Pane et vino, simplici puroque sacrificio, [Melchisedec] Christi dedit sacramentum."—Ad Evang. II.

²⁵⁸ "Id enim sacrificium successit omnibus illis sacrificiis Veteris Testamenti, quæ immolabantur in umbra futuri."—De Civ. Dei, xvii. 20. "Christiani peracti ejusdem sacrificii memoriam celebrant, sacrosancta oblatione et participatione corporis et sanguinis Christi."—Ibid. xx. 18.

memorial of his death: not another sacrifice, but the same do we always make, yet it is rather a memorial of sacrifice, which we perform.”²⁵⁹

Thus we find that, at the first, the bread and wine of the Eucharist were called an oblation in common with other things which were offered for the various uses of the Church, and the necessities of the brethren; and only in common with them, not separately by themselves for the Sacrament. But as the love-feasts were discontinued, and other ways of contribution were added, the elements still retained the name of oblations. And then, being the symbols of the body and blood of Christ, and the memorials of his sacrifice; being, according to his institution, his body and his blood, they were his sacrifice communicated to us. And not only so, but having been offered by the Church, they came to be spoken of as a sacrifice made by it, in a figure. After a time the notion of their being a figure was dropped; and the elements were represented as a real sacrifice in themselves. And lastly, seeing how poor a sacrifice they were by themselves, the doctrine of transubstantiation changed them into the very sacrifice of our Lord Himself; which soon came to be regarded as a sacrifice,—the Eucharistic sacrifice,—offered up to God by the Priest.

The process occupied many centuries: and we see that, in the time of Augustine and Chrysostom, the elements had no more the character of an oblation, than they had in common with the other things that were offered for the Church: and that the name of sacrifice was applied to them, only in the sense of being memorials of a sacrifice.

The abolition, therefore, of the sacramental oblation of the bread and wine, by the Church of England, and the presentation of them in common with “the alms and other devotions of the people,” was a restoration of the true primitive doctrine and practice; the doctrine and practice of the Church for centuries from its foundation.

Evidence, indeed, apparently very strong and decisive, may be produced from the ancient Liturgies, to show that the Church of the Fathers went farther in its practice than they themselves appear in their writings to have gone. But these Liturgies do not go back to the beginning, and are not reliable witnesses

²⁵⁹ Προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ’ ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ· οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰεὶ ποιούμεν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.—In Heb. x. Hom. xvii.

of the doctrine and practice of the age to which they are ascribed. The Liturgies of the "Supreme Churches," as Mr. Palmer remarks, which "appear to be the parents of all the forms now extant, and indeed of all which we can in any way discover,"²⁶⁰ are certainly to be dated at least in the fourth century: and if we had them, as they were then, they would be indisputable witnesses for that time, and would afford presumptive evidence for the previous centuries. But it is not pretended that we have them in their original form. Some, indeed, are asserted to have apostolical authority; which, undoubtedly, may be true so far as this, that the manner and words in which the apostles celebrated Divine Service, would naturally be followed by their successors, and be handed on for the continued use of the Church. But being at first unwritten, the several Liturgies of the Apostles, even if any of them had fixed form, were exposed to the dangers common to all unwritten forms. And after they were committed to writing, they were liable to alterations, as every single Bishop might think fit: though it cannot be justly questioned that whatever variations might at various times and places be made in the Liturgies, everything essential to the valid celebration of the Holy Supper was preserved. Many variations, too, would find their way into them in the process of transcribing. But above all they have been altered, though slowly and infrequently it may be, to harmonise, in some degree,²⁶¹ with the prevalent doctrine of the Churches in which they have been used.

It would be, therefore, in vain to appeal to any of the Liturgies for proof of the doctrine and practice of the primitive Church.

But it is contended that though "the English Liturgy were devoid of any verbal oblation of the bread and wine to God, it nevertheless would not be destitute of a valid oblation of those elements"; that is to say, that "in truth the act of devoting or setting apart a certain portion of bread and wine for the service and honour of God, to be converted into the sacraments of Christ's body and blood, would seem to be as valid an oblation as the act of a layman in presenting the elements to the priest."* This, however, is only an opinion, for which no authority is to be found in the institution, or in the practice of

²⁶⁰ Palmer's Antiquities, i. 7, 8, Oxford, 1832. In this volume the reader will find a very learned and judicious account of the ancient Liturgies.

²⁶¹ That they do not always perfectly harmonise, the Roman Missal is an example.

* Palmer's Antiquities, ii. 86, 85, Oxford, 1832.

the apostolic Church as disclosed to us in the New Testament. There is nothing of a verbal oblation of the elements in either: and if a virtual and implicit oblation of them had been intended as a part of the sacramental rite, it is not to be believed, but that some clear intimation of it would have been given. Indeed, when we read that Christ has taken away "sacrifice and offering and burnt-offering and offering for sin," in order "that He may establish the" will of God;* I cannot but doubt that any oblation or offering of the mere elements, in the sense contended for, was in the mind of our Lord when He instituted the Sacrament, or of the apostles when they afterwards celebrated it.

I must think, too, that it has been clearly proved in the preceding pages, that our Liturgy has no verbal oblation of the bread and wine: and, moreover, that our Church does not intend any such oblation: and if she had intended a virtual oblation, she would certainly not have omitted a verbal one.

That the elements are not an oblation in any sense, I do not mean to contend. In the apostolic and primitive Church they were an oblation in common with alms and other things contributed for the purposes of the Church: and in this sense and way, they would be even "sacrifices with which God is well pleased": † but I cannot concede that they are oblations by themselves, to be offered as part of the sacramental rite. And the Church of England clearly discourages all idea of their being a sacramental oblation, by the very terms in which she directs the presentation of the alms and other devotions of the people, and the placing of the bread and wine upon the Table. She directs the Churchwardens, as I have before noticed, that when they have made their collection from the people, they shall "reverently bring" the bason containing it "to the Priest," and that he "shall humbly present and place it upon the holy Table": but, on the other hand, merely says about the elements, that "when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much bread and wine, as He shall think sufficient." The distinction is very marked, and is irreconcilable with all notions of an oblation of the elements, either verbal or virtual.

We must now, in conclusion, refer to the subjects of the altar and priesthood.

* Heb. x. 8, 9.

† Heb. xiii. 16.

Sacrifice, altar, and priesthood undoubtedly go together: and one implies the other. If there be sacrifice, there must be an altar whereon to offer it, and a priest to serve at the altar. If there be an altar, it is useless without a sacrifice or priest. And if there be a priest, he must have a sacrifice and an altar for it. But the nature of one determines the nature of the others. The altar is determined by the sacrifices belonging to it. If the one be material, so must the other be. Material sacrifice requires a material altar: and though oblations may be made upon a material altar, its proper use is for material sacrifice.

Now it has been shown that we have not an altar for material sacrifice. We have no altar on which we are to consume a sacrifice by fire, because we have not a sacrifice which is to be so offered. We have no material sacrifice: and it is but an abuse of words, to speak of such in the Church of Christ. A sacrifice of that kind must be slain; life must be destroyed; or if brought to an altar, the substance of it must be consumed by fire. And all this was abolished by Christ.

But yet we have altars. We have an altar on which life has been given; on which Jesus suffered; the altar of his cross, on which He gave Himself a sacrifice for us. It belonged to that sacrifice, and to it alone. And as this sacrifice differed from all other sacrifices, so this altar differed from all other altars. It was visible and material: and as it was for one sacrifice only, and that is past, it is now no more. On this altar, then, we can now offer no visible sacrifice, though we offer spiritual sacrifices upon it,—for they require no visible altar;—there is the crucifixion of the “old man,” of “the flesh with the affections and lusts.” We are “crucified with Christ” “to sin” and “to the world.”*

Yet, as the altar in the temple was a type, we have the antitype which corresponds to it. The one looked forward, the other looks backward; the type and the antitype witnessing to one archetypal truth. The altar of the temple, by its continual sacrifices which could not take away sins, witnessed that the sacrifice which should do this was not yet offered. The Christian antitype witnesses that the foreordained victim has been slain, and has taken away the sins of the world. “There remaineth,” therefore, “no more sacrifice for sins”:† and consequently the antitype to the Jewish altar testifies to this,

* Rom. vi. 6; Gal. ii. 20; v. 24; vi. 14.

† Heb. x. 26.

by the absence of all such sacrifices as were figures before. The figures and the types have been fulfilled; the altar of the law and its sacrifices have fulfilled their office: and, therefore, neither altar nor any of such sacrifices as were offered upon it remain.

What, then, is the antitypal altar? As the type was literal and material, the antitype must be spiritual. It is a spiritual altar with spiritual sacrifices. And though we may use a material structure for convenience: neither its substance nor its fashion will make it an altar. As we have "a spiritual house" and "spiritual sacrifices,"* our altar is spiritual also; for the nature of an altar is determined by the nature of the sacrifices which belong to it.

Yet there is a sense, in which we may say that we have a material altar. The law had an altar of prefiguration; we have an altar of commemoration. The altar and sacrifices of the tabernacle were all types and figures, the truth and archetype of which is Christ. The altar of the Church testifies the accomplishment of the truth; and commemorates that "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice" which has been made "for the sins of the whole world." In the sense in which our Lord said, "This is my body which is given for you; This is my blood which is shed for you"; the structure on which the bread and the wine are placed, may be called an altar, because that by and on it "Jesus Christ" is "evidently set forth crucified."† His body given and his blood poured out, in the sense intended by Him, rest upon it: and therefore, in that sense, it may be called an altar: an altar presenting to us his sacrifice once made, once for all offered. And it is not only an altar, but it is a table also: because from it, the body and blood of the Lord are communicated to his people. It is a table, however, only for a spiritual feast; and therefore it is literally no more a table than it is an altar. It is a table neither more nor less than it is an altar: a fact which is generally overlooked. But if it be a table, as it is, because of the spiritual feast for which it is used: it must be also an altar because of the sacrifice, not made, but represented, upon it.

But in the use and service of this altar, we offer ourselves, our souls and bodies, and all that we have, a reasonable service to God: our prayers, praises, and thanksgivings, especially "for that He hath given his Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ," both "to die for us," and "also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament." And such sacrifices consti-

* 1 Pet. ii. 5.

† Gal. iii. 1.

tute the place or structure at which they may be offered a true and spiritual altar.

So also of our substance we bring memorials to God: we give alms for the poor: we offer gifts for the honour and service of God. And where these things are done, where these alms and oblations are given; whether in the city or by the wayside; whether in the church, or at home, or in the cottage, there is an altar of the Gospel, on which is offered a sacrifice well-pleasing to God.²⁶²

On the Priesthood little remains to be said: for the Priesthood must always correspond to the altar and its sacrifices: and therefore, since it is a spiritual altar and spiritual sacrifices which we have, our Priesthood must be spiritual also. But all of the Lord's people, all Christians, are priests; for St. Peter says that they are "an holy and a royal priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices":* and St. John also says that He "that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood—hath made us king and priests unto God and his Father."† And if all the disciples of Christ are priests, then no less are his ministers. But as was the case with the children of Israel, who were "a kingdom of priests,"‡ and yet had an order of priesthood separated from them by a special consecration and sanctions; so also in the Church of Christ. His ministers are not only *primi inter pares*: but they represent those among whom they minister; and being ministers of Christ and ambassadors for Him, the great High Priest, they are priests in a higher sense than their people. They are Priests of Priests; by whom the greatest of all sacrifices is ministered to them, and the greatest of all their sacrifices are offered: the sacrifice of themselves and of their praises to God "for his unspeakable gift." And this Priesthood is not only better than that which had to shed the blood of beasts, and burn their bodies; but is so much better as the Gospel is better than the Law.

²⁶² A ritualist writer in the Guardian, Jan. 28, 1869, says: "how in a poor Irish cabin, he used a *lodge in the mud wall* for celebration of the Holy Communion, with the full assurance that, for that occasion, it was *as truly an altar*, and our Lord as truly present, as in the most magnificent sanctuary on earth."

* 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9.

† Rev. i. 5, 6.

‡ Ex. xix. 6.

CHAPTER XI.

CONCLUSION.

AND now to sum up the results of this dissertation.

I have recognised the demand for a literal interpretation of Scripture in relation to the Eucharist: and I have not only admitted the justice of this demand, but have insisted upon it, in common with the Church of Rome, with Luther, and with Dr. Pusey and his party. And with Dr. Pusey also, I have insisted upon the literal interpretation, not as giving the ultimate meaning, but as the necessary basis of the true and spiritual interpretation. But I am not content with a demand of the literal interpretation; which though vague and general, is in truth and reality, a demand of the literal interpretation of these four words only, "This is my body." I require a literal interpretation of the whole record of the institution, and of the notices to be found in the New Testament in reference to it. And the justice of this demand cannot be either denied or disputed.

I. Confining myself, then, to the revelations of Holy Scripture as the alone authentic source of the true doctrine of the Eucharist, and to the literal interpretation of these revelations as the only true key to that doctrine: I find these three names as the only true key to that doctrine: I find these three names only of this Sacrament delivered to us by Divine authority: "Breaking of bread," "The Lord's Supper," and "the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ": names which are obviously in little harmony with the doctrines of the Real Objective Presence of our Lord's glorified body, and of the oblation of Him as the Eucharistic sacrifice.

II. Then we find that our Lord, giving no sanction to the conceits of those who reject outward ordinances, took bread and wine "of the creature," and commanded them to be received.

III. It was ordinary wheat-bread and wine, such bread and wine as were in common use at the time, which He took: leavened bread, indeed, when He took it, but as appears from several circumstances in the sacred record, not necessarily, or always to be leavened, when his ministers were to take it in subsequent celebrations. And to the wine which He took, we do not read that He added any portion of water. Whether it had been mixed or not before He took it for the Sacrament, Scripture does not say: and it is therefore clearly against the literal interpretation to make any addition of water to the wine, in the celebration of the Sacrament, as well as beyond the letter to make any such addition in private before the service. As the bread and wine which the Lord took were such as were in common use at the time; so, if we follow the letter, we shall take either leavened or unleavened wheat-bread according to the use of the people around: and wine, either mixed or unmixed, as the same use may determine; unsymbolical in either case of anything, but of our Lord's own blood. A limit, indeed, there may be set by the authority of the Church to individual choice or judgment: for her just authority may determine, whether the bread shall be leavened or unleavened, or the wine mixed or unmixed. And the mind of the Church of England has been recently declared by lawful authority to be, that the wine shall not be mixed, either publicly in the service, or privately before it. And for this determination there is this ground, sufficient of itself, that it is not usual in this country to add any water to our wine before we use it. The decision is in full agreement with the letter of Scripture.

IV. Such bread and wine, then, as it is customary to use in the place, being taken, as our Lord took them, with thanksgiving, and given as He gave them, from common are made holy, and are become "His most blessed body and blood."

V. The bread thus taken and given, is "the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for us," and the wine thus taken and given, is his "blood which was shed for us:" for He said: "Take, eat, This is my body which is being given for you; Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood which is being shed for you." It is bread, and yet it is his body: it is wine, and yet it is his blood. One thing is bread and also the Lord's body: the other is wine, and also the Lord's blood. The bread is the body of Christ given and broken for us (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδο-

μενον,—κλώμενον): the wine is the body of Christ poured out for us (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον). This is the letter and the literal interpretation. The bread is not the wine, and the wine is not the bread: neither were they taken or given together. They were taken separately, and given separately. So the body of our Lord is not his blood, nor is his blood his body. The blood is poured out from the body, and therefore is not contained in it. They are separate from each other; and from their separation, the body is dead.

This is the “proper and most plain signification,”* “the most simple,” and the “grammatical signification” † of the words, taken “solemnly and literally;” ‡ the “simple and natural sense:” § and “neither more nor less” than “that which” the words “exactly convey”: || the sense to which “we are rigidly and absolutely bound” by “the exact words.” ||

But they who have made these demands of a literal interpretation,—the Church of Rome and her theologians, Luther, Dr. Pusey and his party,—have most unaccountably forgotten their own words, and, as by a kind of infatuation, have utterly mistaken the literal interpretation. Instead of taking all the words which are necessarily the subject of interpretation, they have, in reality, taken only these four, “This is my body”; and have brought in the aid of rationalism to determine how it is. Instead of adhering to the “proper and most plain signification” of the words “This—is—my body”; the Church of Rome says that “it is not his body, but it contains Himself.” Instead of “the most simple and the grammatical signification” of the words, Luther says that the bread is not the body of Christ, but that it has his glorious body with it. And instead of taking our Lord’s words “solemnly and literally,” “the exact words” to which “we are rigidly and absolutely bound,” and in the sense which they “neither more nor less,” but “exactly convey”; the Tractarian party say also, that the bread is not the body of Christ, but that it has “the real objective presence of Christ,” in it, or under its form.

Thus all these systems,—the Roman, the Lutheran, and the Tractarian,—most plainly deny the words of the Son of God, who said of the bread, “This—is—my body”: for they say It is not his body.

The Church of Rome, moreover, says, that the species of the

* Council of Trent.

† Luther.

‡ Dr. Pusey.

§ Archdeacon Wilberforce.

|| Bishop Moberley.

bread contains our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, whole Christ, God and man : Luther says that the "glorious body" of Christ is joined with the bread or is contained in it, as fire is joined with red-hot iron : and the doctrine of the nineteenth century says, that in the bread or under its form, is the real objective presence of our Lord's glorified body : all the three agreeing in the real objective presence of our Lord, whole Christ, his body, his soul, and his Godhead, in the species of bread, with the bread, or in the bread, or under its form. And this is greatly in excess of the letter. Our Lord said nothing of the species or form of bread. It was bread itself which He took, and it was of bread, literal, substantial bread in all its actual reality, of which He spake. And He said nothing of his glorified body : the body of which He spake was his body which was being given for sin, his body from which his blood was poured out, and therefore his dead body. To speak of his glorified body, is to add, therefore, much more "than the exact words convey" : it is not to set forth the literal interpretation. It is to contradict and to overturn it. It is to bring in from our own reason, a mode in which people may imagine they can conceive how the bread, not may be, but may contain, the body of Christ.

But the utter oblivion in these doctrines of the plain, literal, and natural signification : the violence and absolute outrage which they are upon it, are yet more manifest, when we consider that our Lord took the cup also, and said of it, "This is my blood which is being shed, poured out, for you." For these doctrines not only deny that it—is—his blood, as they deny that the bread is his body : and affirm, in a way, that it contains his blood : but they deny that it is his blood—poured out, separated from the body. They say that the wine is not the blood of Christ, but that it contains the real presence of Himself, his Manhood and his Godhead, whole Christ glorified. They say it is his blood by the presence of his glorified body.

Such is the divergence of these doctrines from the literal signification : so much do they go beyond that which "the exact words convey" : so much are they opposed to their integrity and natural sense.

Nor is this all : for whereas our Lord, in his own Person, in his own real objective presence, took the bread and the cup, and was neither in them nor under their species, form, or appearance : yet these doctrines, notwithstanding, say, that if He was not in them then, He is in them now : or that he was pre-

sent in them by the figure of anticipation, but is now present in them in full and absolute reality. Another violation of the literal interpretation : and a disparagement of the Sacrament administered by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

VI. The literal signification, then, of the words being that the body which our Lord gave, was his body broken and given for sin ; and that the blood which He gave, was his blood poured out from his body : and this while his body was as yet not broken, and his blood was as yet not shed : the literal signification also is, that He gave that which as yet was not. It was to be ; but in literal reality, it yet was not. And now, the body of our Lord broken and given, his blood poured out from it, are not. They are nowhere in the whole world, visible or invisible. And yet He gives them to us, his body broken and his blood poured out. He gives them to us “ verily and indeed,” and as truly, but not more or more truly, than He gave them to the apostles the night before He suffered. Since, then, He gave to them that which was not, but was to be : He gives likewise to us that which is not, but has been. And the true literal signification is, that He gave, and that He gives, not in the letter, but in the spirit : and as it is He that gives, He gives “ in truth.”

VII. The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, given and broken ; his blood poured out ; being no longer in the whole range of existence, they cannot be present, really present, anywhere ; they cannot be present in or out of the bread and wine, or with them, or under their forms. They were not present, nor could be present, in the bread and wine which He gave with his own hands ; they are not and cannot be present in the bread and wine now. Yet He gave his body and his blood with infinitely more reality to the apostles, than if they had torn his flesh with their teeth, and had drunk his blood through their throats. This would have been in the letter which killeth : but He gave in “ the spirit ” which “ giveth life.” And so He gives now to the faithful. He gives his body and his blood to them with infinitely more reality, than if they were present in substance and in the letter : because He gives in the spirit and to life.

VIII. The literal interpretation is, that the elements remain bread and wine ; but that the bread is also the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for us, and that the wine is also his blood which was shed for us. They are both these :

the bread is bread literally, it is the body of Christ spiritually and mystically: the wine is wine literally, it is the blood of Christ spiritually and mystically. This interpretation makes the elements bread and wine in fact: it makes them the body and blood of Christ in effect, but not in fact: the body and blood of Christ, as much as one thing can be another; the body and blood of Christ to all the intents and purposes for which it is necessary that we should eat his flesh and drink his blood. This is the true spiritual interpretation to which the literal interpretation necessarily leads.

IX. Nor is that postulate true, which lays it down, that the body and blood of Christ "must be present, that we may receive them." This is to limit things, confessedly spiritual, by the necessities of material things. And not only so; but the presence, the necessity of which this postulate is thought to demonstrate, is not a presence of the same thing which we receive. The presence supposed is the real objective presence of our Lord Himself: but that which we receive is not Himself: that which we eat is not Christ, the living Lord Himself, but his given body, and that which we drink, is not the living Lord Himself, but his poured-out blood.* And the presence of his body given, and of his blood poured out, is as unnecessary, as it is impossible.

X. Our Lord neither spoke of, nor gave, nor promised, his glorified body: the letter and the literal interpretation is of his given body.

XI. The teaching of the ancient Fathers is in full accord with the literal interpretation I have indicated. With one mouth and one mind, they do all, in various ways, and in various forms of words, say that we are partakers of the body—and—blood of Christ: not that we eat his glorified body, and in eating of it, drink his blood: but that we eat his flesh, and drink his blood shed.

XII. So, also, is the teaching of the divines of the Church of England. Some, indeed, speak of the Real Presence, not in the sense of the nineteenth century doctrine: but in the sense of the presence of our Lord in and to the celebration of his own ordinance: or in the sense that the things which He called and

* See Appendix K K.

made, and now calls and makes, his body and blood, that body and blood are present, to all the intents and purposes for which we are to receive them.

The ancient Fathers, and our great divines, all with one voice and one mind, declare, not that the bread or its species contains in it the real objective presence of Christ; but that the bread—is—his body, and that the wine—is—his blood.

XIII. And such also is the teaching of the Church of England. She speaks of no presence. She says nothing of our Lord's glorified body, or of his being in or under the species or the substance of the elements. She speaks only of his most precious body—and—blood. This it is, which she professes to minister. And by the due reception of this spiritual food, in the spiritual eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, she teaches that "we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us, that we are one with Christ, and Christ with us." *

XIV. As the apostles could not receive the body and blood of Christ, when He Himself ministered, but by faith: for by faith only could they receive that which as yet was not: and as, even at the very moment, and on the spot, in which He gave his body and shed his blood, neither his body nor his blood could be received, but by faith: so now also, none can be partakers of his body and blood, verily and indeed, in the sense intended by Him, but by faith likewise. They are offered, indeed, to all communicants: but the capacity of taking and receiving the things unseen, belongs to that faith only which is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." †

XV. Our Lord is everywhere to be adored: but as He is not in, or contained under, the bread and wine; as He said nothing of being present in them: and as it is beyond and contrary to the literal interpretation to assert, so it is alike beyond and contradictory to it, to worship, such a presence in them.

XVI. Our Lord gave both bread and wine; He gave both his body and his blood. He said not of the one, This is my body and my blood; nor of the other, This is my blood and my body. Whereas He said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." It is beyond the literal interpretation, and contrary to it, to say that He is con-

* See Appendix K K.

† Heb. xi. 1.

tained whole and entire under the species of the bread and under the species of wine; and that therefore being whole under each, it is sufficient to receive one without the other. As He gave the bread separately, his body separately, and gave the wine separately, his blood separately: so also must his Church minister, and his people receive. It is "sacrilege" to divide or mutilate the mystery.

II.

I. Our Lord Jesus Christ having ordained that we should take the bread as his body given for us, and the wine as his blood shed for us: and his holy apostle St. Paul having taught us that we thereby keep a feast; and having called it the Supper of the Lord: the Eucharist is a feast. But it is not a feast upon the bread and wine, and is a feast upon the body and blood of the Lord. It is a feast upon his body slain, given, sacrificed, for us. It is a feast upon his sacrifice: a feast upon his sacrifice, made and offered, and possible to be made and offered, only by Himself: a sacrifice made once for all upon the cross. It can be pleaded, but cannot be offered by man.

II. The bread and wine, which our Lord took, were not a sacrifice themselves, neither were they a part of the sacrifice with which they were taken. Nor do we read that He made a sacrifice or oblation of them. We do not read that He impregnated them with his spirit, that He communicated his Godhead to them, or sent the Holy Ghost upon them, or in either or any way made them a sacrifice "worthy of serious consideration." It is therefore not contained in the literal interpretation, that He offered the bread and wine as a sacrifice or oblation, or that He sacrificed or offered Himself in them. To introduce a sacrifice or oblation of the elements, is clearly to go beyond the letter, to add to it, and to engraft upon the Divine ordinance a ceremony of man's device: a ceremony which, if a sacrifice necessary to be made, seems, if it be not in reality, to detract from the perfection of the sacrifice of Christ.

III. A material sacrifice according to Holy Scripture, being of one or more of certain living or inanimate things appointed by Almighty God, and offered to Him by the destruction of life by blood-shedding, or of being by fire: the bread and wine in

the Eucharist are not a sacrifice in the Scriptural sense of the word.

IV. Nor is there any place in Scripture which can prove, either that bread and wine by themselves ever were a sacrifice, or were appointed to be a sacrifice of the Gospel.

V. Nor again did the ancient Fathers regard the bread and wine as a sacrifice in the sense intended ; nor did they put forth any claim to such a sacrifice, or defend themselves as having it, when Christians were described by their enemies as having neither priest, nor altar, nor sacrifice.

VI. Some, indeed, represent a sacrifice of the bread and wine, as a mere “ empty sign, which cannot seriously be looked upon as a becoming offering : ” * that “ the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice—can only ally itself with a system which supposes that the Holy Eucharist consists of a *res sacramenti* as well as a *sacramentum* ” : and that therefore the sacrifice is especially of the *res sacramenti*, the body and blood of Christ. But one theory makes the *res sacramenti* to be the Holy Spirit, the third Person of the Trinity ; another the Godhead of Christ ; another the glorified body of Christ, Christ Himself, body, soul, and Godhead. And although many passages have been cited from the ancient Fathers and Liturgies as establishing one or other of these theories, none of them have been found sufficient for this purpose : and the *res sacramenti* in them all, the Holy Spirit, the Godhead of Christ, his glorified body, is far above all possibility of sacrifice.

VII. The true Eucharistic sacrifice is shown to be the humble and contrite confession of sin ; the profession of faith in the death of Christ, as a full and perfect satisfaction for sin ; thanksgiving for God’s temporal and spiritual benefits, and especially the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ ; the offering of ourselves and all that we are and have unto God ; and prayers and intercessions for all men. And to these spiritual sacrifices are added material oblations : oblations of our substance for the service and honour of the Most High.

VIII. But these oblations are not of the essence of the Sacrament. And as we do not read, and it is therefore con-

* Archdeacon Wilberforce, *Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, p. 347.

trary to the literal interpretation to allege, that our Lord made any oblation of the bread and wine, when He instituted the Sacrament : so the Church of England has taken care not to go beyond his example. The elements may be an oblation in common with other things given religiously for pious and charitable uses : but as the Church celebrates the Sacrament in all validity and fulness for the sick, without oblations ; so is her doctrine of the Eucharist independent of oblations in her public services.

IX. Still the Church of England has sacrifice, altar, and Priesthood : the sacrifice of which we have spoken, as the true Eucharistic sacrifice ; an altar at which this sacrifice may be offered ; and a Priesthood even among a kingdom of priests.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

Referred to in p. 1, line 13, "from house to house."

This translation of *κατ' οἶκον* is clearly wrong: for if the "breaking of bread" had been "from house to house," it would have been *κατ' οἴκουσ*, as in ch. xx. 20. *κατ' οἶκον*, therefore, signifies some particular house, in which they were accustomed to meet: and this would be the *ὑπερώου* or upper room, in which the eleven assembled together after the ascension; c. i. 13. See Cave's *Primitive Christianity*, I. vi. Lond. 1702, 468, 82: Wordsworth in loc. and Alford, who says it means, *domi*, not *domatim*.

According to tradition, (see Mede on Churches, 408,) this *ὑπερώου** was the *ἀνώγειον*, *cœnaculum*, or large upper room, in which our Lord celebrated the Passover with his disciples, and instituted the Eucharist. And most probably it was. For when our Lord directed the disciples: "go into the city to such a man—*πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα*†—and say unto him, The Master ‡ saith, my time is at hand; I will keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples:" there can be no doubt that the owner of the house was well known to them:—he was perhaps pointed out by name, as the words "to such a man," may intimate; though the name is not given in the narrative; and though the disciples were led to him with certainty by the "man bearing a pitcher of water" (Luke xxii. 10, 13):—our Lord knew that he could be depended on in a season of so great danger:—and clearly,

* Bengel in loc. refers to John Gregorius, who, he says, "copiously describes these upper rooms."

† *ὁ δεῖνα* stands for the name, just as our N.N. Stolz translated "to the well-known man."—Stier's *Words of the Lord Jesus*, vii. 11, in Clarke's Foreign Theol. Library.

‡ "This describes the man as a disciple of Jesus, for the obedience which our Lord predicts, takes it for granted that the receiver of the message would interpret these words—Our Master and thine! so that he would acknowledge the disciples at once, and recognise Him who sent them as his Master and Teacher."—*Ibid.*

there was a mutual understanding with him, either by previous arrangement, or by divine illumination (Matt. xxi. 3), providing for the occasion. The owner of the house would know whom the disciples meant, when they told him; "The Master saith;" and the message: "my time is at hand," would remind him of the time for which arrangement had been made with him, or of which some divine intimation had been given.* In this place, so chosen by their Master, the disciples, according to their national custom, would abide as long as the Feast of the Passover lasted: and according to the injunction (Matt. x. 2), they would remain there as much longer as they had occasion, and had permission of the owner; which, as he was "worthy," and "a son of peace" (Luke x. 6), he was not likely to refuse.

The place was well known to Mary Magdalene, so that she could "quickly" and easily find the disciples who lodged there (Matt. xxviii. 7; John xx. 2, 18): they were assembled in it on the evening after the resurrection, having "the doors shut for fear of the Jews" (John xx. 19): and it would seem (Ibid. 26. Mark xvi. 14. See Townson on the Evangelical History, sec. ix. 54 and 170, Oxon. 1793) that eight days afterwards they were still in the same place.

Subsequently, they went into Galilee (Mark xvi. 7, and John xxi. 1): but we may well think, that on their return to Jerusalem, the safety and kindness they had found in that house, and the recollection of all (Matt. xxvi. 20-30, John xiii.-xvii. xx.) which they had witnessed in that room, would lead them back to it again: nor would its "worthy" owner, that "son of peace," be less willing to receive them, now that they came with the joyful tidings (Luke xxiv. 52) of their Master's having gone up into heaven, than he was, when "his time" of suffering was "at hand." Accordingly we read, that on their return to Jerusalem, "when they were come in, they went up—*εἰς τὸ ὑπερῶον*,—to the upper room,"—not, as it is inaccurately in the English, "an upper room;" but "the upper room,"—that room, doubtless, which was so well known to them. And not only so, but we read also that, in that upper room, Peter and the rest of the apostles were abiding. "And when they were come in"—to the city, "they went up into the upper room, where were abiding—*ἦσαν καταμένοντες*,—both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, James the Son of Alphæus, and Simon Zelotes, and

* "He may be supposed to have received, in some other way, some previous intimation respecting our Lord's purpose."—Brown's *Ordo Saeculorum*, sect. lxxvii., p. 60.

Judas the brother of James" (Acts i. 13). This expresses "a continued occupation," a retaining of the room, even when they were in Galilee: it was their home and abode. And we find this *cœnaculum*, or upper room, called *oikos* in the 2nd verse of ch. ii.

Such are the circumstances which appear to me to show that the tradition is certainly true: that "the room wherein our blessed Saviour, the night before his Passion, celebrated the Passover with his disciples, and instituted the mystical Supper of his body and blood,—was the same place, where on the day of his resurrection, He came and stood in the midst of his disciples, the doors being shut, and having showed them his hands and his feet, said, *Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, so I send you* (John xx. 21): the same place where, eight days or the Sunday after, He appeared in the same manner unto them being together, to satisfy the incredulity of Thomas, who the first time was not with the rest:" the same place, "where, after our Saviour was ascended, the apostles and disciples (as we read in Acts i. 13, &c.) assembled together daily for prayer and supplication; and where being thus assembled, the Holy Ghost came down upon them in cloven tongues of fire, at the feast of Pentecost:" the place where they broke the hallowed bread: "the place where James the brother of our Lord was created by the apostles bishop of Jerusalem: the place where the seven deacons, (whereof St. Stephen was one,) were elected and ordained: the place where the apostles and elders of the Church at Jerusalem held that Council, and pattern of all Councils, for decision of that question, *whether the Gentiles which believed were to be circumcised or not.*"—Mede on Churches, p. 408.

It may be interesting to add, that "the place of this *cœnaculum* was afterwards enclosed with a goodly church,* known by the name of the Church of Sion, upon the top whereof it stood.—How soon this erection was made I know not; but I believe it was much more ancient than those other churches

* Adricomius says: "In this same place, Helena, the mother of the Emperor Constantine, built a temple, very large in length and breadth, in the portico of which she included this upper room."—No. 6, pp. 11, 12, Colou. Agrippæ, 1592. He has a list of works on Jerusalem at the end. Nicephoras, on what authority I know not, adds the following particulars, of extreme interest, if they be true. He says that the blessed Virgin Mary lived in that house eleven years: and that it had come into the possession of John in this way:—his father, Zebedee, left to John and James an inheritance in Galilee, of which John sold his part to Caiaphas—by which means it was that "John was known unto the High Priest"—and with the purchase-money he bought the house with the large upper room, and it was the abode of the Virgin to the end of her days.—Hist. II. ii. 90: Frankfort, 1588.

erected in other places of that city by Constantine and his mother; neither Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoret, nor Sozomen, make any mention of the foundation thereof, as they do of the rest. It is called by St. Cyril, who was bishop of the place, *the upper Church of the Apostles: The Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles in the likeness of fiery tongues, here in Jerusalem*, IN THE UPPER CHURCH OF THE APOSTLES.—Cyril. Hierosol. c. 16." Ibid. See also Bingham's Christian Antiquities, viii. i. 31.

This interpretation of *κατ' οἶκον* will not affect the argument in the text: for as it was the place of the apostles' abode, they must have taken their ordinary meals there, as well as broken the bread of the Eucharist.

But some divines think that this breaking of bread *κατ' οἶκον*, in the house, was the celebration of the Eucharist. And Mede expresses this interpretation exceedingly well. Quoting the verse, "they continued daily in the temple, and breaking bread in the house, they did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart," he says: "the meaning being, That when they had performed their devotions daily in the Temple at the accustomed times of prayer there, they used to resort immediately to this cœnaculum, and there having celebrated the mystical banquet of the Holy Eucharist, afterwards took their ordinary and necessary repast with gladness and singleness of heart."—P. 409.

I do not see sufficient grounds for this interpretation: and Mede does not appeal to the Syriac here. Yet if the interpretation were just, it would make the argument of the text still stronger.

Acts v. 42 must be interpreted similarly to this place of ii. 46.

APPENDIX B.

Referred to in p. 3, "the Sacrament ought not to be consecrated without wine."

Aquinas says:—

"Nec propter defectum alterius est unum tantum sine altero consecrandum, quia non esset perfectum sacramentum."
—3a. q. 74, Art. i. 2°.

"Nor is one only to be consecrated without the other, because it be wanting: for it would not be a perfect sacrament."

* Mosheim (De Rebus Christianis, sec. i. xxxvii.) says: first, one of the apostles delivered a sermon—*doctrine*: then followed oblations for common use of all, chiefly of the poor—*fellowship*, (Rom. xv. 26, 2. Cor. viii. ix. 13. Heb. xiii. 16:) the Holy

But Dens says :—

“Una species seu materia sine alia valide consecratur, ut patet ex veritate formæ Consecrationis, et praxi Ecclesiæ præbentis Eucharistiam sub specie panis adorandam ante consecrationem calicis.”

“One species or matter [of the Sacrament] is validly consecrated without the other, as is manifest from the practice of the Church, which sets forth the Eucharist under the species of bread to be adored before the consecration of the cup.”

There seems to be some discrepancy between this and the definitions of the Council of Trent, which say :—

“In almo sanctæ Eucharistiæ sacramento, post panis, et vini, consecrationem Dominum nostrum, Jesum Christum—sub specie illarum rerum sensibilium contineri.”*

“That in the precious Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ—is contained under the species of those sensible things.”

But if one species is validly consecrated without the other, and the body of Christ is contained under the species of wine, as the Roman doctrine is; then the wine would be validly consecrated without the bread: which, I apprehend, Rome itself would anathematise.

However Dens goes on to say :—

“Illicitum autem est unam materiam sine alia consecrare non tantum Jure Ecclesiastico, sed etiam Divino.—Probatur quia Concil. Trid. sess. 22. cap. 1. postquam dixit Christum Patriobtulisse Corpus et Sanguinem suum sub speciebus Panis et vini, subdit: ‘Ac sub earundem symbolis, Apostolis . . . eorumque in Sacerdotio successoribus ut offerrent præcepit per hæc verba: *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*: uti semper Catholica Ecclesia intellexit et docuit.’

“But it is unlawful to consecrate one matter without the other, not only by Ecclesiastical Law, but also by Divine.

“It is proved [thus]: because the Council of Trent, in the 22nd session, chap. 1, after it said that Christ offered his body and blood to the Father under the species of bread and wine, subjoins: ‘And under the symbols of the same things He commanded the Apostles, and their successors in the Priesthood, to offer by these words: *This do in remembrance of me: as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught.*’

“Confirmatur: quia quotiescunque hoc Sacramentum conficitur, simul offertur Deo sacrificium: ad hujus autem essentiam requiritur consecratio utriusque speciei, ut infra latius ostendetur.

“It is confirmed [thus]: because as often as this Sacrament is performed, there is a sacrifice offered at the same time to God: but for the essence of this sacrifice the consecration of both species is required, as below shall more largely be shown.

“Deinde hoc Sacramentum est institutum per modum convivii spiritualis, quod sub utraque specie perfectius et expressius significatur. Unde inferitur, nequidem *Summum Pontificem* posse dispensare, ut Sacerdos in aliquo casu consecret unicam speciem.”—Theologia, De Eucharistia, No. 12. Vol. v. 266, Dubl. 1832.

“Lastly, this Sacrament was instituted after the manner of a spiritual feast, which is more perfectly and clearly signified under both species. Whence it is inferred that not even the Supreme Pontiff can give dispensation that a priest in any case should consecrate one species alone.”

Supper,—*breaking of bread*: and the assembly was closed by prayers recited by one of the apostles or elders, in which the people followed. This interpretation of fellowship adds still more to our argument.

Tertullian interprets the breaking of bread by St. Paul in the ship (Acts xxvii. 35). of the Eucharist.—De Orat. ix. 24.

* Sess. 13, cap. 1.

I subjoin what immediately follows the above passage, in reference to the attempt sometimes made by polemics of the same creed, to justify the practice of half communion, from those passages, in which the Lord's Supper seems to be intended by the expression "breaking of bread."

"Objicitur. Christus in Castello Emmaus consecravit panem sine vino, Lucæ cap. 24. ergo &c.

"Resp. Imprimis certum non est, Christum ibidem consecrasse.

"2. Similiter incertum est, an simul vinum non consecraverit, licet Evangelista id non exprimat.

"3. Potuit solum panem consecrasse ex potestate excellentiæ, quam nemini communicavit."

"It is objected. Christ at Emmaus consecrated bread without wine. Luke xxiv. therefore, &c.

"Answer. In the first place it is not certain that Christ consecrated in that place.

"Secondly—In like manner it is uncertain, whether He did not consecrate wine at the same time, although the Evangelist does not express it.

"Thirdly—He might have consecrated bread only from the power of his excellence, which He communicated to no person."

APPENDIX C.

Referred to in p. 5, "Sacramentum."

Sacramentum, or *Sacrament*, was the oath of fidelity taken by Roman soldiers. It was therefore a very suitable name for those sacred rites, by which Christians were enrolled in the armies of the Most High, and pledged their allegiance to the Captain of their Salvation.* In this view, it would, perhaps, be used first of Baptism, and then, of the Eucharist, in which the obligations of Baptism are renewed: as the military oath was taken not merely on first joining the standards, but from time to time.

But the word had other meanings not inappropriate:—

"This word Sacrament among the Romans was taken in three senses.

"1. *Pro litis pignore*, for an engagement a man gave at law to answer the action.

"2. For an oath given by the soldier to the general not to desert him.

"3. For a military note, or *pro tessera militari*, by which they were distinguished.

"Now from one of these, or all these, the word might be brought into the Church by an analogy; for the Sacraments may be said to be,

"1. *Pignora*, pawns and assurances on God's part to us, to perform His covenant, and bestow grace.

"2. *Signa juratoria*, on our part; by which we bind ourselves to keep our covenant with God.

* See Tertullian ad Mart. iii.

“3. Or else *tesseræ*, notes and marks by which we are separate from all others, who are not Christians.”—Nicholson on the Catechism, p. 152, Oxford, 1842.

The corresponding Greek term was *μυστήριον*: on which and on “Sacramentum,” see Mr. Malan’s work on “The Holy Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper,” pp. 5-9, &c.

APPENDIX D.

Referred to in p. 7, “The Homilies. No untrue figure of a thing absent.”

These words, by themselves, may be taken to mean, either a true figure of a thing present, or a true figure of a thing absent: and they will be taken in one or other of these senses, according to the proclivities of the reader: some understanding them to mean a true figure of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ. But they must be taken, not by themselves, but with their context, which states what the sacrament is. And there we find nothing whatever to show that it was intended to intimate that the sacrament is a true figure of a thing present, but the very opposite. It is a true figure of the body and blood of Christ: but there is not a word to show that the writer of the Homily meant to intimate that they are really present.

Cranmer, too, says:—

“They be no vain or bare tokens, (for a bare token is that which be-tokeneth only and giveth nothing, as a painted fire, which giveth neither light nor heat:) but in the due ministration of the sacraments God is present, working with his word and sacraments.”

Again, he says:—

“I never said that Christ is utterly absent, but I ever affirmed that He is truly and spiritually present, and truly and spiritually exhibited unto the godly receivers: but corporally is He neither in the receivers, nor in nor under the forms of bread and wine.”—Works, Parker Soc., I. ii. 127.

Jewell says:—

“We direct our faith only unto the very body and blood of Christ, not as being there really and fleshly present,—but as sitting in heaven at the right hand of the Father.”—Defence against Harding, Part II. c. xiv. Div. 1. Works, Parker Soc., 1848, p. 526.

See more in his Controversy with Harding, p. 448.

And Hooker says :—

“We take not baptism nor the Eucharist for bare resemblances or memorials of things absent, neither for naked signs and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, not (as they are in deed and in verity) for means effectual, whereby God, when we take the sacraments, delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify.”—*Eccles. Pol. V. i. lviii.*

Augustine says :—

“How shall I hold Him who is absent? How shall I send my hand into heaven, that I may hold Him who sits there? Send forth faith, and thou hast held Him.”*

APPENDIX E.

Referred to in p. 9, “Sacraments.”

Peter Lombard discourses so well on the Sacraments, that I must enrich my pages with some extracts from his great work.

“Sacramentum est sacræ rei signum. . . .

“Sacramentum est invisibilis gratiæ visibilis forma. Signum vero est res præter speciem quam ingerit sensibus, aliquid aliud ex se faciens in cogitationem venire. Signorum vero alia sunt naturalia, ut fumus significans ignem, alia data. Et eorum quæ data sunt, quædam sunt sacramenta, quædam non. Omne enim sacramentum est signum, sed non e converso. Sacramentum ejus rei similitudinem gerit, cujus signum est. Si enim sacramenta non haberent similitudinem rerum quarum sacramenta sunt, proprie sacramenta non dicerentur. Sacramentum enim proprie dicitur quod ita signum est gratiæ Dei, et invisibilis gratiæ forma, ut ipsius imaginem gerat, et causa existat. Non ergo significandi tantum gratia sacramenta instituta sunt, sed etiam sanctificandi. Quæ enim significandi gratia tantum instituta sunt, solum signa sunt, et non sacramenta: sicut fuerunt sacrificia carnalia et observantiæ cærimoniales veteris legis, quæ nunquam poterint justos facere offerentes: quia ut ait Apostolus, Sanguis hircorum, &c., *Heb. ix.*

“A Sacrament is the sign of a sacred thing. . . .

“A Sacrament is the visible form of an invisible grace. But a sign is a thing beyond the appearance which it conveys to the senses, causing from itself some other thing to come into thought. But of signs, some are natural, as smoke signifying fire; others are appointed. And of those which are given, some are sacraments, some not. For every sacrament is a sign, but not every sign is a sacrament. A sacrament bears the likeness of that thing, of which it is the sign. For if sacraments had not a likeness of the things of which they are sacraments, they would not properly be called sacraments. For it is properly called a sacrament, because it is in such manner a sign of the grace of God, and a form of invisible grace, that it bears its image and is its cause. Sacraments, therefore, were not instituted for the purpose of signifying, but also of sanctifying. For those things which are instituted for the purpose of signifying only, are signs only, and not sacraments: as were the carnal sacrifices and ceremonial observances of the old law, which never were able to make the offerers righteous: because, as the Apostle says, The blood of goats, &c., *Heb. ix.*

* “Quomodo tenebo absentem? quomodo in cælum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte, et tenuisti.”—*In Joan. xi. Tract. L. 4.*

“. . . Sed nunquam ex operibus legis aliquis justificatus est, ut ait Apostolus (Rom. iii., iv., et Gal. ii.), etiam si in fide et charitate fierent. Quare? quia imposuit ea Deus in servitutem, non in justificationem, et ut figuræ futuri essent, volens sibi ipsi potius offerri ea, quam idolis. Illa ergo signa erant, sed tamen et sacramenta: licet minus proprie in Scripturis sæpe vocantur: quia signa erant rei sacræ, quam ubique non præstabant. Illa autem Apostolus opera legis dicit, quæ tantum significandi gratia, vel in onus instituta sunt. . . .”

. . . “But by the works of the law no one was ever justified, as the Apostle says (Rom. iii., and Gal. ii.), even though they were done in faith and charity. Wherefore? because God imposed them for bondage, not for justification, and that they might be figures of the future, desiring them to be offered rather to Himself than to idols. They therefore were signs, and yet also sacraments: although they are less properly called so in the Scriptures: because they were signs of a sacred thing, which indeed they did not afford. The Apostle, moreover, calls them works of the law, which were instituted for the purpose of signifying only, or for, a burden.”

APPENDIX F.

Referred to in p. 11. Application of the name, and number, of the Sacraments.

The first application of the name to any part of the Christian religion, was, as I apprehend, to Baptism, and the Lord's Supper (Note 5). Casaubon* thus accounts for its wider use:—

“The oath which the Legions took is said to be τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς σεμνὸν μυστήριον,† a holy or solemn mystery of the dominion of the Romans, or, as Tacitus speaks, *arcanum dominationis, the secret of dominion*. Therefore the Romans called the oath *Sacramentum, a Sacrament*. And μυστήριον with the Greeks, and *Sacramentum* with the Romans, are terms of religion, full of a certain reverence and majesty. On this account, from the very beginning, the Church assumed to herself the use of them, and not only named all secrets of religion mysteries and Sacraments, but applied those words peculiarly to that doctrine, which Augustine and Lombard call *of signs*, and the Greeks *symbolical theology*. For they named the visible signs of invisible things, *sacramenta* and μυστήρια, *sacraments* and *mysteries*.”

I am afraid that this attempt to identify *arcanum* and *sacramentum*, as alike names of the military oath, is more ingenious than successful. See Tacit. *Annal.* ii. 59. In *Hist.* i. 4, is “*imperii arcanum*.” See also a note in the var. ed. of Tacitus, *Amst.* 1685, vol. ii. p. 44.

Another account, not inconsistent with the above, is, that in

* Ad Baron. *Prolegom. Exercit.* xvi. An. xxxiv. num. xliii. p. 479.

† This expression is in Herodian, viii. 19, Oxon. 1704.

various places of the New Testament where the word *μυστήριον*, mystery, or secret, is found, the Latin word used to interpret or translate it, was *sacramentum*: “for the old interpreter was unwilling to say *arcanum*” (which means any secret thing), “lest he should seem to speak below the greatness of the things; and therefore he put *sacramentum* for *arcanum*,” as expressing a mystery or secret of religion.*

Hence:—

“There is nothing more usual with the ancients than this way of speaking, to call every sacred rite or ceremony used in the Church, by the name of a ‘sacrament,’ or ‘mystery.’ Cyprian (*De Orat. Domin.* 5) speaks of sacraments in the Lord’s prayer.—It is usual also with the ancients to divide the proper sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, each of them into two or more, meaning the several parts or rites belonging to them.” †

But Baptism and the Eucharist were regarded as mysteries or sacraments in a higher sense than all others. See “Justin Martyr, *Apol.* c. 79 to the end; Tertullian *de Cor. Mil.* c. 3. Augustin *De Doctr. Christ.* III. ix. 13, Ep. 118 and 23; Chrysostom *Hom. in Johan.* 85.” (Welchman *On the Articles*, art. 25.) Also Ep. 119; and Justin Mart. *Dial. cum Tryph.* and Cyril. *Hierosol. cat.* xviii. 32, 33, Augustin. *de Vera Relig.* c. 17.

For proof of the two Sacraments in succeeding times, see *Tracts against Popery*, tit. vii. c. 1, pp. 16, 17.

Rabanus Maurus, and after him, Fulbertus Carnotensis (ad init. cent. x.) named only two. Rupertus Tuitiensis, contemporary with Lombard, names three only: Baptism, the Eucharist, and the double gift of the Holy Ghost.

“Alexander of Hales saith, that there are only four which are, in any sort, properly to be said sacraments of the new law; that the other three supposed sacraments had their being long before, but received some addition by Christ manifested in the flesh.”—Field, on the Church, *Append.* III., xv., vol. ii. pp. 361, 362.

* *Calv. Inst.* IV. xiv. 2.

† Bingham’s *Christ. Antiq.* XII. ii. 4.

Tertullian calls all Christianity the Sacrament of Christian religion, *religionis Christianæ Sacramentum*. *Adv. Marcion.* iv. 2: and he calls Elisha’s axe the Sacrament of wood. Augustine speaks of the Sacraments of the Old Law (*De Mend.* vi.), and of the Sacraments of bread, of fish, of numbers, of the rock, &c. (See Barrow on the Sacraments.) Of later writers, Cranmer speaks of the Sacraments of the Old Testament; and also of the Sacrament of the body, and the Sacrament of the blood (On the Lord’s Supper: preface, and lib. iii. 75); and Usher (?) speaks of the Sacraments of the Old Testament, and of the Sacrament of Circumcision (Body of Divinity). See also Cranmer’s *Remains*, &c., Cambridge, 1846, p. 115.

Cardinal Bessarion says :—

“These two sacraments only do we read to have been clearly delivered in the Gospels.”*

Hugo de S. Victore (A.D. 1120) *De Officiis*, i. 12, and Peter Lombard (A.D. 1141) *Sent.* iv. *Dist.* ii. 1, were the first who numbered seven Sacraments; which number, devised by them, was “first decreed (A.D. 1439) by Eugenius IV.; first confirmed in the provincial Council of Sens; and after in the Council of Trent (sess. 7, A.D. 1547);” (Bramhall’s Answer to M. De La Milletiere, Works, Oxford, 1842, i. 55). This number was adopted at Trent, because there are seven virtues, seven vices, &c., &c. F. Paul’s *Hist. Council of Trent*, l. ii. sess. 7, an. 1547.

Luther held three sacraments. He said :—

“Three only are to be laid down, baptism, penance, and the bread. Although, if I wished to speak in the use of Scripture, I should have only one sacrament, and three sacramental signs.”†

A return to primitive truth required the abolition of the mystic number; and when, as the Homily says, “the exact signification of a Sacrament” was considered, it was plain that there are but two sacraments; and that no other rites which in a general acceptation were, and might be, called sacraments, have the like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord’s Supper.‡

Our Church does not altogether forbid that other things should be called Sacraments, though she clearly discourages it, asserting that they “are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel.”§ Sacraments, she allows they may be, in a general acceptation: but she does not herself call them by this name, but rites and ceremonies; || nor will she permit them to be numbered as sacraments with those two which alone are properly such: for that “no man ought to take them for sacraments in such signification and meaning as the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper are.”

The Romanist doctrine respecting the Sacraments, so far as the present subject is concerned, is, that there are neither more

* “Hæc duo sola Sacramenta in evangelis manifeste tradita legimus.”—*De Sacram. Euch.* in *Biblioth. Patrum*, Par. 1624, VI. 482.

† “Tria tantum ponenda, Baptismus, Pœnitentia, Panis. Quamquam, si usu Scripture loqui velim, non nisi unum Sacramentum habeam, et tria signa sacramentalia.”—*De Capt. Bab. Eecl. Opp. Jenæ*, 1600, II. i. 261, A.

‡ Art. 25. § Ibid. || As in the title page of the Book of Common Prayer.

nor less than seven; and that they are necessary to salvation, though not all to every person:* and so the Church of England, putting away this novel and pernicious doctrine, declares the truth of Scripture and of Catholic antiquity, that “Christ has ordained in his Church” the Sacraments of “Baptism and the Lord’s Supper” “only, as generally necessary to salvation.”

APPENDIX G.

Referred to in p. 11, at bottom, “the Quakers.”

I do not use this name offensively, nor am I aware that it is offensive to those who are called by it. It is the name given to them in Acts of Parliament; and I apprehend, that when any of their body declines to take an oath in a court of justice, he does not scruple to declare himself a Quaker, in order to avail himself of his legal exemption. Barclay says, that though “it was first reproachfully cast upon” them, and was “none of their own choosing, yet in this respect they are not ashamed of it; but have rather reason to rejoice therefore, even that they are sensible of this power, that hath oftentimes laid hold upon their adversaries, and made them yield unto them, and join with them,” &c.—Apology, Prop. xi. 8.

See in Neander’s Church History, I. 35, an extract from a supposed work of Apollonius of Tyana, in which silent prayer is represented as most worthy of the Deity.

APPENDIX H.

Referred to in p. 14, “The reception of disciples in baptism with water by our blessed Lord.”

“Though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples” (John iv. 2). It is insinuated from this, that the disciples

* “Si quis dixerit, Sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo, Domino nostro, instituta; aut esse plura, vel pauciora, quam septem, videlicet, Baptismum. Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Pœnitentiam, Extremam Uncionem, Ordinem, et Matrimonium; aut etiam aliquod horum septem non esse vere, et proprie Sacramentum; anathema sit.”—Can. i.

“Si quis dixerit, Sacramenta novæ legis non esse ad salutem necessaria, sed superflua; et sine eis, aut eorum voto per solam fidem homines a Deo gratiam justificationis adipisci: licet omnia singulis necessaria non sint; anathema sit.”—Can. iv. Conc. Trid. sess. vii.

baptized, merely from their own opinion, and without their Master's direction:—

“The Lord Jesus Christ,” it is represented, “rendered in his own person a complete obedience to all righteousness as it was observed under the law; and therefore he submitted to the baptism of John. But his own converts who belonged to that spiritual institution, which he so frequently denominates the ‘kingdom of heaven’ (See Matt. xi. 11, &c.), he *baptized not*. Although he permitted his disciples to practise that ceremony, he abstained from it himself. This fact is noticed by the apostle John, who after stating that, ‘the Pharisees heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John,’ carefully adds, (for the prevention of error, no doubt, on so interesting a subject,) ‘though (or howbeit) *Jesus himself baptized not*, but his disciples.’ Those preachers of the gospel, therefore, who consider it their duty, in conformity with the great fundamental law of Christian worship, to abstain from the practice of baptizing their converts in water, have the consolation to know that, in adopting such a line of conduct, they are following the example of him, who is on all hands allowed to have afforded us a *perfect pattern*.” *

This argument refutes itself. If the conduct of our Lord be a pattern for his ministers in the sense intended here, that they should do whatsoever He did, and not do whatsoever He seems not to have done; then, as our Lord “permitted” his disciples to baptize, it would certainly follow, that the ministers of his Gospel should not forbid their disciples to baptize also.

But was it only by permission of Jesus that his disciples baptized? Was it purely their own doing, in imitation of the Baptist, as this writer seems to hint, and suffered by their Master for a time? Baptism was indeed of common occurrence in the case of Gentile converts to the law. It was not a mode of initiating a Jew into any of the sects, which divided their nation: but it was known as an indispensable rite in the admission of strangers to the privileges of the Jewish Covenant. It signified the putting away of one religion, and the acceptance of a better. The preaching of baptism to the Jews, therefore, was in effect, calling upon them to enter into a better covenant, and to take upon them a better law than they had hitherto enjoyed. And John was the first who, since the Law, imposed baptism on Jews.†

* Gurney on the Religious Peculiarities, &c., p. 103.

† From Zech. xiii. 1 it was understood that the Messiah would baptize, or that baptism would be practised at his coming, even on the Jews themselves, as introductory to his reign. When, therefore, John baptized, and yet denied that he was the Messiah, or “Elias which was for to come,” or that prophet like unto Moses, whom the Lord their God was to send (Deut. xviii. 15), they asked him, “Why baptizest thou then?”

There was, therefore, neither precedent in common practice, nor temptation for the disciples of our Lord to exalt themselves, unbidden, to baptize any of their own nation. The practice of John would be no precedent for them; whatever they might find to imitate in his disciples. They might, indeed, compare their Master with John, and might naturally expect Him to baptize as John did: but as we do not read of the disciples of John baptizing, there was no precedent for the disciples of Christ to baptize, if Christ Himself did not. And if Christ Himself did not baptize, it is a very gratuitous supposition, that his disciples did so without his order. If they did, they must have regarded it as an oversight and defect in Him, that He did not baptize: they must have undertaken to supply it, in unaccountable contradiction to their own Jewish prejudices; and in disregard of the anger and indignation of their countrymen; who might well have asked, why they should take it upon them to baptize, if their Master did not require it?

Again, it is clear that all the disciples of Christ were baptized: for it is said that He "baptized disciples," that is, made them disciples by baptism. It was by this rite they were admitted to be disciples. Is it then to be said, that He would wink at those who attended him applying the rite universally, if it were inconsistent with the spirituality of the kingdom He was founding? And if it was by baptism,—as it certainly was, and might be proved by further testimonies,—that his disciples were made: then, truly, no man can pretend, that the very rite, without which no one was admitted to be his disciple,—a rite so significant in itself, so derogatory to Jewish pride, was used without his express authority and direction.

And again: The baptism of his disciples was well understood to be his act; though it was equally well known that He did not himself actually administer the rite. "The Pharisees heard that He made and baptized more disciples than John;" and the disciples of John reported to their Master: "He that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold the same baptizeth, and all men come to Him" (John iii. 26). And in agreement with this, the very Evangelist, who explains that "Jesus Himself baptized not, but his disciples," said previously, that "Jesus and his disciples came into the land of Judea; and there He tarried with them and baptized" (ch. iii. 22); representing, that while He did not himself baptize, the performance of the rite by his disciples, was in just construc-

tion his act. It is impossible to reconcile the language of the Evangelist to any other supposition.

One more remark is obvious:—if it be said that the ministers of Christ ought “to abstain from the practice of baptizing in water,” because Christ did not Himself baptize; then by the same rule, it is unjustifiable, not to administer the other sacrament, which He *did* celebrate, and of which He so pointedly said, “do this in remembrance of me.” And if so, then, by the Quakers’ own rule, it is proved that there *are* signs under the Gospel.

APPENDIX I.

Referred to in p. 15, The necessity of water in baptism.

“Can any man forbid water,” said St. Peter, “that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we?” (Acts x. 47)—an invincible proof, that water is a necessary part of the baptism, which our Saviour instituted. The Quaker would have boldly responded to the apostle’s challenge; denouncing water-baptism as adverse to the spirituality of the Gospel; and averring, that as the Holy Spirit had been given, and the substance was present, the sign and the shadow were superseded, and must be dispensed with. But the apostle and his companions,—all under true spiritual illumination,—judged otherwise: and that which the Quaker would assert utterly annulled the outward form, St. Peter, with the assent of all who were with him, lays down as the very reason why the outward form should be observed. It was because they had received the Holy Ghost, that “he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord,” ver. 48.

APPENDIX K.

Referred to in p. 16. Connection of St. John vi. 32–63, with the institution of the Eucharist.

“God’s words alone throw the true light upon God’s works;”—this utterance is just as true when inverted—God’s works also throw the true light upon his words. This two-fold canon has a most perfect application to the relation between John vi. and the institution of the Supper, under two aspects; the

Sacrament is to be understood according to this word, and this word is to be explained by the Sacrament. When the Lord, being about to give his flesh for the life of the world, appointed his body and blood to be eaten and drunk in the future, must He not have thought of what had been said at Capernaum, and have reminded his disciples of it likewise? Was not this institution a fulfilment of that previous discourse? Were both *without any connection*? We think it impossible to affirm this. And can we suppose that Christ, when He was speaking at Capernaum, did not at all think of the future Sacrament? We regard that as equally impossible and unimaginable."

"Tanti hoc sacramentum est momenti, ut facile existimari potest, Jesum, ut prodicionem Judæ, v. 71, et mortem suam, ita etiam Sacram Cœnam, *de qua inter hæc verba certissime secum cogitavit*, uno ante anno prædixisse, ut discipuli possent prædictiones postea recordari. Tota hæc de carne et sanguine Jesu Christi oratio passionem spectat, et cum ea Sacram Cœnam. *Hinc separata carnis et sanguinis mentio constanter.*"—Bengel.

"Of so great moment is this sacrament, that we may easily think, that Jesus, as one year before he foretold the treason of Judas, and his own death, so also he foretold the Sacred Supper, of which in those words he most certainly thought in himself, so that the disciples might afterwards remember his prediction. This whole discourse of the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ looks to his passion, and with it the Sacred Supper. Hence constantly [or consistently] the separate mention of his flesh and blood."

"Yea, verily, to this also belongs what is said in the 6th verse of the same chapter, 'He Himself knew what He would do.'"—Stier's Words of the Lord Jesus, v. 195.

"The Lord's Supper points back to this discourse as its foundation."—Ibid. 195.

"John who has historically recorded neither the appointment of baptism nor the institution of the Lord's Supper, has exhibited to us instead, how the Lord, in ch. iii., prophetically spoke of the nature of Christian baptism, and here in ch. vi. of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Von Gerlach admits this: 'as baptism is the sacrament of regeneration of water and of the spirit, so the holy supper is the sacrament of this quickening and renewing through the flesh and blood of Christ, and therefore stands in the same relation to this discourse, which baptism does to the conversation with Nicodemus.'"—Ibid. 195, 196.

APPENDIX L.

Referred to in p. 16. The necessity of using the means appointed for eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ.

"They had learned before, that his flesh and blood are the true cause of eternal life; that this they are not by the bare force of their own substance, but through the dignity and worth of his person, which offered them up

by way of sacrifice for the life of the whole world, and doth make them still effectual thereunto: finally, that to us, they are life in particular, by being particularly received. Thus much they knew, although as yet they understood not perfectly to what effect or issue the same would come, till at length being assembled for no other cause which they could imagine, but to have eaten the passover only that Moses appointed, when they saw their Lord and Master, with hands and eyes lifted up to heaven, first bless and consecrate, for the endless good of all generations till the world's end, the chosen elements of bread and wine; which elements made for ever the instruments of life by his divine benediction, they being the first that were commanded to receive from him, the first which were warranted by his promise, that not only unto them at the present time, but to whomsoever they and their successors after them did duly administer the same those mysteries should serve as conducts of life, and conveyances of his body and blood unto them."*

"Neither is it ordinarily his will, to bestow the grace of sacraments on any, but by the sacraments, which grace also, they that receive by sacraments or with sacraments, receive it from him, and not from them. For of sacraments, the very same is true, which Solomon's wisdom observeth in the brazen serpent, 'He that turned towards it was not healed by the thing he saw, but by Thee, O Saviour of all.'"†

APPENDIX M.

Referred to in p. 16, "The way in which the true believer,—he who has faith to eat spiritually,—is instructed that he is to do it."

Mr. Gurney, referring to the manner in which the Church of England speaks of the Eucharist, says:—

"By such language a mystical importance is attached to this outward rite, which appears to have no foundation in the original use of the ordinance, as a simple memorial of the death of Jesus. In these days of increasing light and spirituality, as we may justly esteem them, it is necessary to say but very little on this branch of our subject. Although the communicants in the rite of the Lord's Supper may sometimes be permitted to 'eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man,' no arguments need now be advanced to prove that this spiritual eating and drinking has no necessary connection with any external ceremony; and that in every time and place it may be the privilege of the humble Christian, who lives by faith in the Son of God, and whose soul is subjected to the purifying yet sustaining influence of his Holy Spirit; see John vi. 53, 63. Neither will it be any longer disputed, that when persons of such a character meet in companies for the solemn purpose of worshipping the Father, they may,

* Hooker, Eccl. Pol. v. 67.

† Ibid. v. 57.

without any use of the outward ordinance, *feed together in a spiritual sense on the body and blood of Christ*, and experience the truest communion with their Holy Head, and one with another *in him*; see Matt. xviii. 20.*

Now that "the original use of the ordinance" was not "as a simple memorial of the death of Jesus;" but that it was "some other more excellent and heavenly use;" we know infallibly from these words of St. Paul: "the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the *communion of the blood of Christ*? the bread which we break, is it not *the communion of the body of Christ*?" (1 Cor. x. 16.) "Let him be our teacher for the meaning of Christ, to whom Christ was Himself a schoolmaster; let our Lord's apostle be his interpreter, content we ourselves with his explication." † We may say indeed: "would that all the Lord's people were prophets" (Num. xi. 29), as St. Paul was: but it is very clear, that the boasted "light and spirituality" of "these days" are not yet equal to the brightness and holiness of the apostle's: especially when alleged faith and spirituality are advanced, as superseding the positive institution of Christ, and annulling the order of his kingdom.

It is readily admitted, that "eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man," "has no necessary connection with any external ceremony:" such a connection would amount to the *opus operatum* of the Romanists.‡ But the connection is sufficiently strong for our guidance, if He, who alone can impart those blessings, has in any way, and under any conditions, joined them with outward forms. It is written that "man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that

* On the Religious Peculiarities, &c., pp. 107, 108.

† Hooker, Eccl. Pol. v. 67.

‡ In a review of the first edition of this work, the Ecclesiastic asks "where we can find a description of 'the *opus operatum* of the Romanists'"; and while the reviewer claims to "have some acquaintance with the *opus operatum* of the Schoolmen," he calls the "*opus operatum* of the Romanists a bugbear, which" he had "not come across in any Roman Catholic writers" he had happened "to have read" (viii. 310).

Now, in the first place, if we may presume that the Schoolmen were Romanists, their *opus operatum* might very well be called the *opus operatum* of Romanists: and since it was a very practical doctrine affecting the use of the Sacraments, and from its nature was generally acceptable, and moreover was recognised by the Council of Trent, it might, with great justice, be called the doctrine of the Romanists. The Schoolmen, it must be allowed, were not quite agreed about it: but they agreed so far as that the work of the Sacraments was wrought upon the recipients, more or less independently of them. The work was considered to be wrought upon them, and they were but recipients.

But for "a description of the *opus operatum*," I may refer to Hook's Church Dictionary, in which there is a brief but tolerable account of it, and to both Harding and Jewell, in the Bishop's Defence of his Apology, article 21; where there is a pretty full account of it. Jewell describes it in his Apology in these very few words, as regards the mass, that "even for that it is said and done," it "is able to remove—sins": that is, that the mere celebration of the mass takes away sins. This, of course, requires "a *subjectum capax*," as the reviewer says: but he is quite mistaken in thinking that

proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. iv. 4). Natural life, therefore, has no necessary connection with bread: we know that a man may eat, and not be nourished by it; he may eat bread, and yet die: but we know also as well, that if a man will not eat, he cannot live; he must die. God has given us

"faith or charity" were considered requisite to the capacity. Witness the following dicta, as cited in Jewel:—

"Ex opere operato: id est, ex ipsa consecratione, et oblatione, et sumptione venerabilis Eucharistiæ."—Gabriel Biel Lect. 27, in can. Ex opere operato.

"Opus operatum esse consecrationem, oblationem, et perceptionem sacramenti."—Scotus Quodlibet, art. 2.

"Opus operatum est actus exercitatus circa sacramentum: sicut opus operatum in Baptismo est inspersio vel immersio aquæ, et prolatio verborum."—Manipulus Curatorum.

"Fides non est necessaria accessuro ad Eucharistiam."—Cajetan. in Urspergen, Paralip. 1518, fol. 471.

"Eucharistia, in quantum est sacrificium, habet effectum etiam in aliis pro quibus offertur: in quibus non præexigit vitam spiritualem in actu: sed in potentia."—Biel, Lect. 85.

"Ex opere operato: that is, from the very consecration, and oblation, and taking of the venerable Eucharist."

"That the opus operatum is the consecration, oblation, and receiving of the sacrament."

"Opus operatum is an act exercised about a sacrament: as opus operatum in Baptism, is the aspersion or immersion with water, and the pronouncing of the words."

"Faith is not necessary in one coming to the Eucharist."

"The Eucharist, so far as it is a sacrifice, has effect even in others for whom it is offered: in whom it does not require a spiritual life in act, but in possibility."

The Council of Trent, session vii., canons 6-9, supply the following definitions:—

1. "Sacramenta novæ legis—continere gratiam quam significant:

2. "gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicem conferre:

3. "dari gratiam per hujusmodi sacramenta semper, et omnibus, quantum est ex parte Dei:

4. "per ipsa novæ legis Sacramenta ex opere operato—conferri gratiam:

5. "in tribus Sacramentis, Baptismo, scilicet, Confirmatione, et Ordine,—imprimi characterem in anima, hoc est signum quoddam spiritale et indelibile."

1. "That the Sacraments of the New Law contain the grace which they signify:

2. "That they confer the grace itself on those who do not place a bar against it:

3. "That grace is given by such sacraments always, and to all, so far as regards God's part:

4. "That by the Sacraments themselves of the New Law grace is conferred ex opere operato:

5. "That in three Sacraments, Baptism, namely, Confirmation, and Orders, there is imprinted on the soul, a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign."

The opus, the work, is the Sacrament, whatever it be: the opus operatum, the work done, is the sacrament administered. By this, ex opere operato,—from the work being done,—as the instrumental cause (causa instrumentalis, Aquinas, 3^o, q. 62, art. 1) God, the principal cause (causa principalis), causes grace, always and to all who do not place a bar against it. Observe, it is not "habentibus," but "ponentibus—obicem": which must mean, "who do not set a wilful hindrance"—who do not wilfully reject or refuse the grace.—See Moehler's Symbolism, i. 288.

The recipient is not, at least necessarily, an agent in the matter. The work is not his: it is God's only, the principal cause in the instrumental cause. He is the operans and by his minister: the recipient is not necessarily operans, but the subjectum apax, operated upon. He is necessarily but passive: admitting the grace, as a cup receives the wine poured into it. If he has faith and charity, so much the better, and he more fruitful the sacrament for him: but if he does not wilfully and purposely reject it, he receives it ipso facto and ex opere operato. As De la Hogue expresses it:—

Ex ipsa ritus externi efficacia, [gratia] tanquam ex fonte defluit in subjectum; from the very efficiency of the external rite, grace, as from a fountain, flows down into the object."—De Sacramentis, IV. i., Dublin, 1828, 30.

earthly bread, that we may eat thereof and live: but the word of God, by which, even with bread, man lives, is not tied to it, and “has no necessary connection” with it. And thus the Son of God, by whom it is that the natural bread nourishes, and “strengthens man’s heart;” while He has ordained that except we “eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood,” we shall have no life in us; has also said of the elements in his holy supper, “this is my body, this is my blood.” He took them, and blessed them to that purpose, and appointed them to that office. Here then, assuredly, is a connection strong enough for those who are to walk by faith and not by sight: and it must be a bold thing to separate what He has joined; a “stubborn and a faithless” thing, surely, to expect the blessing, when we look not for it where He has laid it up; when we seek it not, as He has specially told us we are to seek it.

“We know that, of those who dipped their vessels in the fresh streams which gushed from the rock and flowed on the sand of the desert, and drank,—they themselves and their cattle,—from the fresh river, many rebelled against God, and their carcasses fell in the wilderness (Heb. iii. 17). They were destroyed of the destroyer (1 Cor. x. 10). And they were figures of us (1 Cor. x. 6, 11).

“But, did they who drank *not*, live? This is the question for *us*. All who receive the Sacraments are not saved by Sacraments. But will they who *reject* them, live? They who refuse the Table which God spreads for them in the wilderness, and they who will not dip their vessel in the stream which flows in the dry places, how will they live?—They may die, though they drink; but if they *refuse* to drink, will they,—can they—live!”—Wordsworth on the Apocalypse, lect. v. p. 152, ed. 2.

God is certainly not tied to the Sacraments, so that He would not give grace without them: but we are tied to them so far that, if we reject them, we cannot hope to receive the grace they are ordained to give.

It is no light thing, even ignorantly, to reject any ordinance of the Lord of life; or, though with the best intentions, to neglect any means of grace, thinking that it is not tied to them. The man who refuses to eat, thinking that life is not tied to bread, will die from his mistake. Is there not some correspondence to this case, in that of a man who will not receive that which the Lord gave; who will not eat that which the Lord said “Take, eat;” because he thinks that eternal life is not

tied to outward forms? Is such an one's persuasion, faith? is his "spirituality," holiness? and is he, who takes upon himself to judge that the outward form is unnecessary, all the while keeping his word, who said, "Do this in remembrance of me?"

If the disciples were to eat the bread, because the Lord said: "this is my body;" and to drink of the cup, because He said: "this is my blood:" it will hold good to the end of the world, that all who have need of that body and of that blood, are to eat and drink as He first taught his Apostles.

That the flesh and blood of the Son of Man are not to be received in any other way, than in the Sacrament of the Supper, we must not say: for the faith, by which alone they are apprehended, is that by which we live (Gal. ii. 20): and, therefore, in proportion as we have life through it; in the same proportion, we are made partakers of that body and blood, without which we have no life in us.

But when Christ has said: "this is my body; this is my blood;" is it faith, which says: "it is not?" or is this to have communion with the Father and the Son, to affect "a more excellent way," than the Lord Himself has expressly commanded?

It has been insinuated, I believe, that the statement above about receiving the flesh and blood of Christ in other ways, than in the Sacrament of the Supper, savours more of the doctrine of "The Society of Friends," than of Catholic truth. I would therefore submit the few following testimonies, out of many which might be produced in reference to that paragraph:—

"Cum igitur absque sacramentis (quibus non alligavit potentiam suam Deus) homini gratiam donare posset, prædictis de causis sacramenta instituit."—Peter Lombard, Sent. iv., Dist. 1, D.

"Nulli est aliquatenus ambigendum, tunc unumquodque fidelium corporis sanguinisque Domini participem fieri, quando in baptisate efficitur membrum Christi; nec alienari ab illius panis calicisque consortio, etiamsi antequam panem illum comedat, et calicem bibat, de hoc seculo in unitate corporis Christi constitutus abscedat. Sacramenti quippe illius participatione ac beneficio non privatur, quando ipse hoc quod illud Sacramentum significat, invenitur."—Fulgentius, in fine libelli de Baptismo Æthiopsis, cited by Usher; Answer to a Jesuit, p. 45, c. 3. Cambridge 1835.

"Since, therefore, without the Sacraments (to which God has not bound His power) He was able to confer grace on man, He instituted the Sacraments for the aforesaid causes."

"One must not at all doubt that everyone of the faithful is then made partaker of the Lord's body and blood, when in baptism he is made a member of Christ; nor that he is estranged from the fellowship of that bread and cup, although before he eat that bread and drink that cup, he depart out of this world, having been settled in the unity of the body of Christ. For he is not deprived of the participation and the benefit of that Sacrament, when he himself is found to be that which this Sacrament signifies."

“Nos ipsi corpus Christi effecti, sacramento, et re sacramenti, capiti nostro jungimur et unimur.”—Cyprian, De Dom. Cæn. p. 44, op. Oxon. 1682.

“We ourselves, having been made the body of Christ, are by the sacrament, and the *res sacramenti*, joined and united to our Head.”

“We have no reason to question, but that a person baptized will be a partaker of the body and blood of Christ our Saviour, though he should happen to die before he receive the consecrated bread and wine.”—Lanfranc in Collier, Eccl. Hist.

“If a man—by any—just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ’s Body and Blood, the curate shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed His blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul’s health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth.”—Rubric in “The Communion of the Sick.”

APPENDIX N.

Referred to in p. 35. The mixed cup.

I have given what appeared to me the most probable account of the origin of this custom. But there are many, who think that it more probably arose from the tradition of a mixed cup having been used at the institution. L’Arroque’s observations are very fair and just.

“Seeing the four Divine Writers which have related in their sacred books the history of the Institution of the Sacrament, have not mentioned, whether the Wine which our Saviour used in instituting and celebrating the Sacrament, was pure, or mixed; the antient Christians made no scruple to mingle water with the Wine in the Communion. The Jewish Rituals, as a learned person, and extremely well vers’d in the knowledge of the Uses and Customs of that Nation, observes, left it unto the free will and choice of every person in celebrating the Passover, to use pure Wine, or Wine mixt with water; so that our blessed Saviour accommodating himself as much as he could in the celebration of his Sacrament, with what was practis’d in the celebrating the Jew’s Passover, it seemeth to me impossible, considering the silence of the Evangelists and of St. Paul, to determine whether the Wine employ’d in the celebrating of his Sacrament, was mixed with water or not: Nevertheless it is most certain that the Ancients believed that there was water mingled with the Wine, and that it was upon this perswasion that they established the custom of so doing; a very ancient practice, seeing that St. Justin Martyr, who wrote

about fifty-two years after St. John, doth expresly mention it: for in shewing the manner of celebrating the Sacrament in his time, he observes positively that there was presented unto the Pastor, Bread, and a Cup with Wine mingled with Water; that after he had blessed and consecrated them, all those which were there present received of the Bread, the Wine, and the Water, which had been consecrated. Indeed as the first Christians sought not so many mysteries as those which came after, I mean that they troubled not themselves in seeking out of Mysteries in most things relating to Religion, so they satisfy'd themselves with the innocent practice of this custom, and religiously to observe this use, with much simplicity; but above one hundred years after St. Justin had writ what is above express'd, they bethought themselves of seeking a mystery in this mingling of water with the Wine: The first, if I mistake not, that pleased himself to discover a mystical signification in the Wine and Water in the holy Cup, and of the mingling the one with the other was the glorious Martyr St. Cyprian."—L'Arroque's Hist. of the Eucharist, by Walker, Lond. 1684, Part i. c. i.

APPENDIX O.

Referred to in p. 37. Symbolism of the mixed cup.

The mixed cup was supposed to have certain mystical significations: such, for instance as is set forth in the following passage from St. Cyprian:—

"Aguas namque populos significare, in apocalypsi Scriptura divina declarat, dicens: *Aguas quas vidisti, super quas sedet meretrix illa, populi, et turbæ, et gentes Ethnicorum sunt, et lingue.* (Rev. xvii. 15.) Quod scilicet perspicimus et in sacramento calicis contineri. Nam quia nos omnes portabat Christus, qui et peccata nostra portabat, videmus in aqua populum intelligi, in vino vero ostendi sanguinem Christi. Quando autem in calice vino aqua miscetur, Christo populus adunatur, et credentium plebs ei in quem credidit, copulatur et conjungitur. Quæ copulatio et conjunctio aquæ et vini sic miscetur in calice Domini, ut commixtio illa non possit ab invicem separari. Unde Ecclesiam, i. e. plebem in Ecclesia constitutam fideliter et firmiter in eo quod credidit, perseverantem, nulla res separare poterit a Christo, quo minus hæreat semper et maneat individua dilectio. Sic autem in sanctificando calice Domini, offerri aqua sola non potest, quomodo nec vinum solum non potest; nam si vinum tantum quis offerat, sanguis Christi, incipit esse sine nobis: si vero

"That waters signify peoples, Holy Scripture declares in the Revelations, saying, The waters which thou sawest, on which the whore sitteth, are peoples and multitudes and nations and tongues. Rev. xvii. 15). This too we perceive is contained in the mystery of the cup. For because Christ [bore] us all in that He bore our sins also, we see that in the water the people are intended, but that in the wine is shewn the blood of Christ. But when in the cup water is mingled with wine, his people are united to Christ, and the multitude of believers are united and conjoined with him in whom they believe. Which union and conjunction of water and wine is so mingled together in the cup of the Lord, that that commixture cannot again be separated. Whence neither can the Church, that is, the people settled in the Church, faithfully and steadfastly persevering in what they have believed, be by aught separated from Christ, that its indissoluble affection should not ever adhere and abide with him. Thus then in consecrating the cup of the Lord, water alone cannot be offered, as neither

aqua sit sola, plebs incipit esse sine Christo: quando autem utrumque miscetur et adunatione confusa sibi invicem copulatur, tunc sacramentum spiritale et cœleste perficitur. Sic vero calix Domini non est aqua sola, aut vinum solum, nisi utrumque sibi misceatur, quomodo nec corpus Domini potest esse farina sola, aut aqua sola, nisi utrumque adunatum fuerit et copulatum, et panis unius compage solidatum. Quo et ipso sacramento populus noster ostenditur adunatus, et quemadmodum grana multa in unum collecta, et commolita, et commixta, panem unum faciunt: sic in Christo qui est panis celestis, unum sciamus esse corpus, cui conjunctus sit noster numerus et adunatus.”—Ep. ad Cæcil. Opp. Fell. pp. 153, 154.

can wine alone. For if any should offer wine alone, this is as though the blood of Christ were without us; but if there be water alone, the people begin to be without Christ. But when both are mingled, and by an infused union each is joined with the other, then the spiritual and heavenly Sacrament is perfected. Thus then the cup of the Lord is not water alone or wine alone, unless both are mingled together, as also the body of the Lord cannot be meat alone, or water alone, unless both be united and joined together and compacted into one cohering bread. In which mystery also our people are shewn to be united, so that as many grains collected and ground and mingled together make one bread; so in Christ, who is the heavenly bread, we may know that there is one body, wherewith our whole number is conjoined and united.”—Epistle to Cæcilius. Library of the Fathers: The Epistles of St. Cyprian, 1844, pp. 188–191, Ep. 63.

On the expression above:—

“Neither can wine alone,” a note subjoins: “i.e. so long as the received practice remains. Yet it is to be observed, that what is said to contain a mystery does not always remain unaltered and inviolable in the Church. Formerly the faithful used a somewhat larger loaf in the Eucharist, that all who partook of it might be shewn to be ‘one bread,’ and to be made partakers of the communion of the broken body of the Lord. Then it became the practice to use wafers, but the mystical meaning is not lost; for they represent the pieces of silver, the price of the body of the Lord. In this same epistle, St. Cyprian relates that the Holy Eucharist was at first celebrated by the Lord at night, nor was this without a mystery (§ 13); but he subjoins, ‘but we in the morning celebrate the Resurrection of the Lord,’ whence also that will appear, that ‘we wish to walk in the light of Christ.’ Again, by the degree of Eugenius, the Roman Pontiff, it is ordained that water be mingled with the cup to be consecrated, in ‘small quantity;’ and so, by the superabundance of the wine above the quality of the water, is signified the superabundance of the merits of Christ our Lord, and his dignity above the human nature and the sins of the human race. Yet not less suitably by the use of wine alone, is it shewn that we are saved by the merits of Christ alone and by his blood. In like way the Greeks pour warm water into the consecrated cup, to signify (as Balsamon explains in Can. 32. Conc. Trull.) ‘that what flowed from the holy side of our Lord Jesus Christ are life-giving.’ The Latins use cold water, in witness that Christ really died, and that we are saved only by his death. In like manner in Baptism; formerly trine immersion was required, as significant of the Trinity; then single followed, that we might profess that we acknowledged one God. [In the Spanish Church, see Bingham, 11. 11. 8.] Immersion also seemed necessary, that we might seem to be buried with Christ in baptism; now, we are sprinkled

with water, that we may be seen to be cleansed by the sprinkling of his blood. In like way, milk and honey conjoined were added to the water of baptism, and were, on that account, offered as well as bread and wine, which however afterwards went into disuse according to the decrees of the Canons, the mystery of the Sacrament being thereby unimpaired.

“P. Lombard (4 Sent. Dist. 11) gives the same gloss, (that is, on the words of Cyprian,) The words admit of an exception, *ought not* unless done out of simplicity or ignorance, or *can not* i.e. *ought not*; (which last is adopted by Durandus in 4 Sent. Dist. 11. qu. 5;) and a little before, ‘if any, with no purpose of introducing heresy, through forgetfulness or ignorance omit the water, the Sacrament doth not appear to be null [irritum], but such an one is gravely to be censured.’ In like way St. Thomas in 1 Cor. xi., and St. Bernard, Ep. 69. ad Guidon. Abbat., ‘They say that some other writer thinks otherwise, namely, that this sacrifice cannot be without these things, i.e. bread, wine, and water, so that, should any of these be wanting, the rest are not sanctified. But of things of this sort, let each be satisfied in his own mind.—Nor do I deny that bread and wine mingled with water ought to be placed on the altar together; rather I assert that it ought not to be done otherwise. But it is one thing to blame negligence, another to deny the efficacy. It is one thing, I say, to say in blame, that anything is not well done, another to assert falsely that it is altogether not done.’—[Quoted by Voss. de S. Cœnæ Domin. Symbol. Disp. Theol. 22. Opp. t. 6, p. 440 sqq.]

“Bishop Fell further observes that it is doubtful, whether our Lord consecrated in pure or mingled wine, since either were used alike, (Tosephoth,) [but it is said Berachoth, f. 50. 2, ‘The wise confess to R. Eliezer that the blessing is not said over the cup of wine, until they have put water to it.’ The Gemara adds, ‘because their wine was very strong, and it seemed not good to drink it without water.’] ‘Whence Aquinas, (p. 3. qu. 74. art. 7, and qu. 83. art. 6. ad loc.) and Bonaventura (in 4 Sent. Dist. 11. p. 2. q. 3) [Biel. Dist. IV. qu. 2. Concl. 5] say that the admixture of water is not of necessity, nor essential to the integrity of the Sacrament. The heresy of the Armenians was, that they held that water, of necessity, ought not to be mingled with the wine; and they were condemned by the Conc. quini-sext. [hence the schoolmen make the exception, ‘unless the water be omitted to introduce heresy.’]

“The Roman Church, although it seems to decree that ‘the cup of the blood of the Lord Christ ought not to be consecrated in pure water, nor in pure wine without water, but in wine mixed with water;’ yet, if we consider it attentively, they mean that it should be consecrated in wine only; for they direct that the water should be added in a very small quantity, (in the words of Eugenius, *modicissima*.) and that there should be an interval between the mingling and the consecration, in order that the water might be turned into wine. (See Cat. Rom. c. 4. § 17. Sacerdotale Rom. p. 1. Tr. 19. c. 2.) And to this effect a passage is wont to be cited from Aristot. de Generat. et Corrupt. l. 1. c. ult., that the lesser passes into the predominant, as a drop of wine is not *mingled* with 10,000 Choëis of

water, but its nature is lost and the whole becomes water. Then also the Greek practice is to be observed, of which Balsamon says, 'Before the holy cup is consecrated, the warm water is not infused, but after the consecration;' and accordingly water, in their opinion, does not enter into the sacred mystery, but follows on it.' [F.]

"On the other hand, wine is declared essential, 'but water without wine can in no wise be offered in the sacrifice.' P. Lomb. l. c., and an old Missal Eccl. S. Mart. Turon. ap. Bal., 'If the consecration have been either of wine alone, or of water without wine, the wine is accounted as a Sacrament, but the water is not so accounted.' Yet 'Pope Innocent VIII. allowed the Norwegians to consecrate the cup without wine, because, on account of the exceeding cold, wine imported in that country easily turns acid.'—Raphael Volaterran. l. 7, p. 159, ap. Bal."

I have given these passages at length, because they bring together so much on this subject in a small compass: and because I suspect that there are not a few, for whose turn of mind the cautions and qualifications, even of the advocates of such mystical observances and meanings, may be salutary. Let us recount them in order, with one or two additions from other sources.

The wine, then, in the mixed cup, is supposed to represent, first, the Divine nature of Christ:* secondly, his superabundant merits: thirdly, the flock of Christ composed of many persons, as the wine is pressed from many grapes.† The water is also supposed to represent, first, the human nature of Christ: secondly, the people of Christ: thirdly, men's sins: fourthly, when cold, the death of Christ: fifthly, when warm, the heat of the Saints, the heat of faith full of the Holy Ghost,‡ the life-giving power of that which flowed from the Redeemer's side. The mixture of the wine with water, is supposed to represent, first, the union of the Divine and human natures in Christ: secondly, the union of Christ with his people: thirdly, the indissoluble affection of Christ and his Church. And lastly; the bread, being composed of many grains, is imagined to represent the Church, composed of many men: while, on the other hand, the wafers used by the Roman Church, signify "the pieces of silver, the price of the body of our Lord."

The question will at once occur;—What authority is there for any of these in Holy Scripture? The simple truth, that the bread signifies the body, and the wine the blood, of Christ, appears to me subversive of them all. They are, in fact, sub-

* Athanas in Psalm lxxiv., L'Arroque, p. 6.

† Cyprian, Ep. lxi. 4, p. 224. Lib. Fathers.

‡ Covel on the Greek Church, p. 26.

versive of each other. To call such things Catholic is a most mischievous abuse of the word; notwithstanding the great and venerable names, which may be brought in behalf of any of them. They are but the private opinions of individuals, or are peculiar to detached and degenerated portions of the Church: and are very far short of possessing universality, either as to time, to extent, or to numbers. They have antiquity, but not Scripture: they have continuance, but not from the beginning: they have never, at any time, been received by the whole Church: and though they have many advocates, yet these differ amongst themselves.

Certainly, we know from Holy Scripture, that the Sacraments have mystical meanings. St. Paul frequently alludes to those of baptism; as in Rom. vi., Gal. iii. 27, Col. ii. 12, and iii. 1, Heb. x. 22: and St. Peter in his 1st Ep. iii. 21. And this Sacrament will retain its appropriate and essential significations, whether administered by immersion, aspersion, or affusion. But the mystical meaning, which, on the authority of Scripture, we know that the Sacraments have, is sometimes lost by the changes which have been made in them. Thus St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 17), in allusion to the Eucharist, says, that "we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." But when, instead of one loaf, the Roman Church uses wafers for communion; then the true mystical meaning is lost; and it is ill supplied by imagining that the wafers represent the pieces of silver for which Judas sold his Master. The Sacrament then becomes emblematical, not of unity, but of unconnected individuality.

It is one thing, too, to find mystical significations* in the Sacraments, as they were instituted by our Lord; and a totally different thing to introduce changes in them, for the purpose of making them emblematical of truths which they embody or imply: as for instance, to put salt, as the Roman priests† do, into the mouth of the person to be baptized, to signify the

* Illustrations also, and comparisons, such as the following: "like as bread is made of a great number of grains of corn, ground, baken, and so joined together, that thereof is made one loaf; and an infinite number of grapes be pressed together in one vessel, and thereof is made wine; likewise is the whole multitude of true Christian people spiritually joined, first to Christ, and then among themselves together in one faith, one baptism, one Holy Spirit, one heart and bond of love."—Cranmer on the Lord's Supper, i. 39. Camb. 1844, p. 42.

† "Cerimonie particulares Baptismu præcedentes, quæ fiunt ante introitum Fontis Baptismalis, inter varias alias præcipue sunt quatuor: nimirum

"The particular ceremonies preceding baptism, which are performed before the entering into the baptismal font, amongst various others are chiefly four: to wit

saving power of Christian doctrine; to anoint with chrism, symbolising the unction of the Holy One; to give milk and honey, to denote that they are as new-born babes. Things of this kind may please the imaginative; but they have little of edification. They are unnecessary, and may be dangerous: obscuring the truths which they symbolise, and detracting from the Sacraments which they accompany; perhaps, in effect, sometimes displacing them.*

Very different are the true "doctrinal uses of the Sacraments:" as, when in such an argument as Leslie has so admirably constructed in his "Short Method with the Deists," they are employed to prove the truth of the Gospel: or when the Lord's Supper is said to "show forth his death" (1 Cor. xi. 26). Or when, again, it was used to prove the truth of his body against the Docetæ: or baptism supplied a weapon against the Arians, and proved against the Pelagians the doctrine of original sin. See at length a Charge of Waterland's, entitled "The Doctrinal Use of the Christian Sacraments considered." Works, viii. 127, 1823.

exorcismus, signum crucis, salis gustus, et linitio salivæ.

"Concomitantes, quæ fiunt post introitum Baptisterii, præcipuæ sunt etiam quatuor: scilicet abrenunciatio, unctio baptizandi oleo catechumenorum, catechismus, et inquisitio voluntatis suscipiendi Baptismum.

"Subsequentes, quæ peracto jam Sacramento adhibentur, præsertim sunt hæ tres: unctio baptizati per chrisma, vestis candidæ donatio, et cerei ardentis traditio."

Dens v. 205: De Baptismo, No. 40.

exorcism, the sign of the cross, the tasting of salt, and the anointing with spittle.

"The concomitant [ceremonies], which are performed after the entering into the baptistery, are also chiefly four: namely, the renunciation, the anointing the person to be baptized with the oil of the catechumens, the catechizing, and the enquiry of the desire of receiving baptism.

"The subsequent [ceremonies], which are used after the performance of the Sacrament, are especially these three: the anointing the baptized by chrism, the presentation of the white robe, and the delivery of the burning taper."

How little do they know of "Popery," who venture to accuse our Church or our Prayer Book of it.

* Examples of the weight which the ignorant attach to trivial observances, must be familiar to every clergyman. In some places, for instance, it is customary at funerals to carry the body up into the chancel, and to turn it round there before going out: and this is invariably done, even with the bodies of infants. I remember once, at the funeral of a child, that the chancel was closed up for repairs: and because the usual procession into the chancel was thus prevented, the mother passionately bewailed it, complaining that her child had not received Christian burial. The whole service was nothing in her estimation, without that trivial and accidental observance. Again, how frequently is it found, that baptism is regarded as nothing more than the giving of a name: so that when the name is once given, the Sacrament itself is neither desired nor thought of.

If we did not know, that people will more readily submit to a regulation arbitrarily imposed by an individual, than bear their part in an observance of Church discipline and rules, for the sake of conscience and unity; we should think it surprising, that the celebration of baptism, or the churcing of women, after the service, has not been taken as a slight upon the parties, and resented accordingly.

“ Well did the ancient Fathers, who opposed this heresy [of Eutyches] make use of the Sacramental union between the Bread and Wine and the Body and Blood of Christ, and thereby shewed that the humane nature of Christ is no more really converted into the Divinity, and so ceaseth to be the humane nature, than the substance of the Bread and Wine is really converted into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, and thereby ceaseth to be both Bread and Wine. From whence it is by the way observable that the Church in those days understood no such doctrine as that of Transubstantiation.”—Pearson on the Creed, Art. iii. p. 162, Ed. 1692 : “ Which was conceived.”

The reasons for the mixed cup are stated by the Council of Trent as follows :—

“ Monet deinde sancta Synodus, præceptum esse ab Ecclesia sacerdotibus ut aquam vino in calice offerendo miscerent, tum quod Christum Dominum ita fecisse credatur, tum etiam quia e latere ejus aqua simul cum sanguine exierit. Quod Sacramentum hac mixtione recolitur : et cum aquæ in Apocalypsi beati Johannis populi dicantur ; ipsius populi fidelis cum capite Christo unio repræsentatur.”—Sess. 22, De Sacrificio Missæ, c. vii.

“ *Lastly, the Holy Synod admonishes that it is enjoined by the Church on priests, that they should mix water with the wine in offering the cup, as well because it is believed that the Lord Christ did so, as also because from his side water came forth with blood. Which Sacrament is renewed by this mixture : and since, in the Apocalypse of blessed John, peoples are called waters ; the union of his faithful people with Christ their head is represented.*”

Many of the Fathers thought that the two Sacraments were denoted by the water and blood. See Chrysost. ad Johann. xix. 34 : Theophylact. in Johann. xix : Cyril. Alex. in Johann. lib. 12 : Leo Magnus Ep. ad Flavian : August. in Johann. Tr. 9. 15 : in Psal. 40, &c. : De Civ. Dei, xv. 26 : De Symbolis, c. vi.

One place from Augustine, I will subjoin :—

“ Dormiente Adam fit Eva de latere. Mortuo Christo lancea perforatur latus, ut superfluant Sacramenta quibus formatur Ecclesia. Unde Apostolus ipsum Adam dicit formam futuri. (1 Cor. xv.) Quia sicut in Adam omnes moriuntur, ita in Christo omnes vivificabuntur.”—Sent. Decerp. 328. Paris. 1555.

“ *While Adam slept Eve is made from his side. Christ being dead, his side is pierced with a lance, that the Sacraments, by which the Church is formed, might overflow. Whence the Apostle (1 Cor. xv.) says that Adam himself is the form of him that was to come. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.*”

See also Suicer in voc. *αἷμα*, and Beveridge on the Articles ; Art. xxv., note t, pp. 441, 442 ; Oxford, 1845.

The Church of Rome admits that the addition of water does not pertain to the essence of the Sacrament.

“ Missale Romanum de defectibus Missæ titulo 4 Num. 7, dicit aquam apponendam non esse, si celebrans post Consecrationem Calicis reflectat, illum prius non fuisse appositam ; secus vero, si illud advertat ante Consecrationem Calicis.

“ *The Roman Missal says on defects of the Mass, that water is not to be added, if the celebrant after Consecration of the Cup reflect that it was not previously added ; but otherwise, if he perceive it before the Consecration of the Cup.*”

“Nec mixtio illa est præcepti divini; non enim in Scriptura vel Sanctis Patribus tale præceptum reperitur; sed est solius præcepti Ecclesiastici, ut loco citato insinuat Trid. dicens: ‘Monet S. Synodus præceptum esse ab Ecclesia, &c.’”

“Nor is this mixture of Divine precept; for such precept is not found in Scripture or in the Holy Fathers; but it is of Ecclesiastical precept alone, as [the Council of] Trent implies in the place cited; ‘The holy Synod admonishes, that it is enjoined by the Church, &c.’”

The following is a sample of Romanist speculations on the mixed cup.

“Superest quæstio, quid fiat in Consecratione de illa aqua vino consecrando admixta.

“Tres sententiæ referuntur ex Innocentio III. Prima dicebat, aquam illam converti in aquam, quæ fluxit ex latere Christi; sed hæc opinio nulla probabilitate nititur.

“Secunda vult, quod aqua illa non mutetur in sanguinem Christi; sed maneat vini accidentibus circumfusa; hæc etiam opinio vix probabilis est.

“Tertia docet, aquam illam converti in sanguinem Christi: et hæc tanquam certa haberi potest.

“At major est controversia, utrum illa aqua *immediate* convertatur in sanguinem Christi; an vero prius convertatur in vinum et sic mediate in sanguinem Christi.”—Dens, v. 273. De Euch. No. 16.

“The question remains, what becomes of the water which is mixed with the wine to be consecrated.

“Three opinions are brought from Innocent III. The first said, that that water is converted into the water which flowed from the side of Christ; but this opinion leans upon no probability.

“The second will have it, that that water is not changed into the blood of Christ; but remains poured round the accidents of the wine: this opinion also is hardly probable.

“The third teaches that that water is converted into the blood of Christ: and this may be held as certain.

“But greater is the controversy, whether that water is converted immediately into the blood of Christ: or in deed is first converted into wine, and so, mediately, into the blood of Christ.”

How happily do the Scriptural doctrines and ritual of the Church of England protect us from such subtle, uncertain, and unprofitable speculations.

APPENDIX P.

Referred to in p. 49. Defective Doctrines of the Eucharist.

Zuingle is commonly regarded as the chief patron of this class of errors. He was charged by both Romanists and Lutherans with teaching that the Sacraments are bare signs and symbols. Socinus claims him. (De Usu, &c. Opp. Biblioth. Frat. Pol. I. 766. Irenop. 1656.) Hospinian (Hist. Sacr. II. 27, &c.) labours hard to clear him from this charge; but I think, not with entire success: for though he shows that Zuingle expressed, in the strongest terms, the necessity of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ; yet the passages which he cites from Zuingle’s Annotations on St. John vi. contain

repeated assertions that eating is nothing else than believing :* nor does he show that Zuingle taught that there is any participation of the flesh and blood of Christ, peculiar to the Lord's Supper, more than to any other spiritual action, or exercise of faith.

Socinus states his doctrine of the Eucharist in the following terms:—

“Dico, in sumptione illa panis et vini quæ fit in cœna Domini, nihil præter panem ipsum et vinum, sive a credentibus sive a non credentibus accipi, nec corporaliter nec spiritaliter. Quandoquidem non aliquid nobis dandi causa ritum hunc instituit Dominus; sed ut, quæ jam dedit, a nobis commemorentur, deque iis gratiæ agantur; idque communiter comedentibus et bibentibus nobis simul ex eodem pane et ex eodem poculo, unde nos ejusdem corporis esse intelligatur, omnesque simul eorundem beneficiorum Christi participes; et indissolubili mutæe charitatis nodo inter nos conjunctos. Ex quo factum est, ut hic ritus ab antiquissimis temporibus, nominibus communionem et conjunctionem significantibus appellatus fuerit. Itaque non percipitur ullo modo, nec ab ullis in cœna Domini, ex vi aliqua singulari, sive ex ipsa cœna manante, sive inibi potius, quam alibi divinitus proficiscente, corpus et sanguis Domini, sed jam sumptum utrumque eo modo fuisse, quo sumi potest, declaratur. Id autem aliud nihil est—quam agnosceret et sentire, ex plagis, vulneribus et morte, quam in cruce Dominus sustinuerit, factum esse, ut—nos voluntatem Dei testatam atque obsegnatam habuerimus, qui ipsi Christo fidem habentibus, id est, ei obediuntibus, peccatorum omnium remissionem, et porro æternam vitam, quemadmodum ipse Christus promiserat, argiri et donare decreverit.”—*Brevis*

“I say, that in that taking of bread and wine which is done in the Lord's Supper, nothing more than the bread itself and wine is received, whether by believers or unbelievers, either corporally, or spiritually. Forasmuch as the Lord did not institute this rite for the purpose of giving anything to us; but that those things which he has already given should be commemorated by us, and thanks be given for them; and this by our eating and drinking together in common of the same bread and of the same cup, whence it may be understood that we are of the same body, and all partakers together of the same benefits of Christ, and joined with each other by an indissoluble bond of mutual charity. From which it has been, that this rite from the most ancient times, has been called by names signifying communion, and conjunction. Therefore the body and blood of the Lord is not received in any way, or by any in the Lord's Supper, from any singular efficacy, whether flowing from the supper itself, or divinely originating there, rather than elsewhere; but it is declared that each has been already taken in that manner, in which it can be taken. This also is nothing else—than to acknowledge and feel, that from the stripes, the wounds, and the death which the Lord suffered on the cross, it has come to pass, that we have had the will of God testified and sealed, who to those who have faith in Christ himself, that

* “Some learned writers having observed that our Lord in that chapter attributes much to a man's believing in him, or coming to him, as the means to everlasting life, have conceived that faith, or doctrine, is what He precisely meant by the bread of life, and that believing in Christ is the same with the eating and drinking there spoken of. But the thing to be received is very distinct from the hand receiving; therefore faith is not the meat, but the mean. Belief in Christ is the condition required, the duty commanded: but the bread of life is the reward consequent. Believing is not eating or drinking the fruits of Christ's passion, but is preparatory to it, as the means to it. In short, faith, ordinarily, is the qualification, or one qualification; but the body and blood is the gift itself, and the real inheritance. The doctrine of Christ lodged in the soul, is what gives the soul its proper temperature and fitness to receive the heavenly food: but the heavenly food is Christ himself, as once crucified, who has since been glorified. See this argument very clearly and excellently made out at large by a late learned writer.” (Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice. p. 393, &c. [c. ii. 5. col. i. p. 501, &c. Oxford, 1847.]) Waterland's Review, &c., c. vi. Works, vii. 103, Oxford, 1823.

Introd. ad Cœnæ Domin. finem, &c. Opp. in Biblioth. Frat. Pol. Irenop. 1656, I. 754.

is, are obedient to him, has decreed to bestow and grant remission of all sins, and moreover eternal life, as Christ himself had promised."

The Remonstrant doctrine of the Eucharist, as laid down by Limborch, is not less meagre than the Socinian.

"Cœna Domini est alter N. Testamenti ritus, quo fideles in Jesum Christum credentes, et ex fide vitam secundum ejus præcepta instituentes, esu panis fracti et potu vini effusi, mortem servatoris Jesu Christi grata mente commemorant, seque vera ac viva ejus membra esse profitentur, qui corpore ac sanguine ejus spiritualiter, non aliter ac corpora nostra pane ac vino, aluntur; seque invicem tanquam unius corporis membra vera in Christo charitate complectuntur."—*Limborch. Theol. Christ. V. lxx. Amstel. 1686, p. 656.*

"Dicendum ergo, quod nobis in Cœna datur esse merum panem et vinum; ea autem esse signa corporis ac sanguinis Christi: quia cerimonia illa fractionis panis et effusionis vini adumbratur, qua ratione corpus Christi pro nobis sit fractum, et sanguis effusus. Quia autem per istam actionem maxima apparet esse similitudo inter panem ac corpus Christi, et inter vinum ac sanguinem Christi; hinc panis et vinum usitato loquendi modo solent corpus et sanguis Domini appellari. Aliud mysterium in ritu hoc, qui maxime simplex est, quæri non debet."—*Ibid. c. lxxi. p. 665.*

"*The Supper of the Lord is the other rite of the New Testament, in which they who are faithful believers in Jesus Christ, and from faith rule their life according to his precepts, by the eating of bread broken and the drinking of wine poured out commemorate with a grateful mind the death of the Saviour Jesus Christ, and profess that they are true and living members of him, who by his body and blood are nourished spiritually, not otherwise than our bodies by the bread and wine; and mutually embrace themselves with true charity in Christ as members of one body.*

"*It must be said therefore, that what is given us in the Supper is mere bread and wine; yet that these are the signs of the body and blood of Christ: because by that ceremony of breaking of bread and pouring out of wine is shadowed forth, with what purpose the body of Christ is broken for us, and his blood poured out. Because moreover by that action there appears to be the greatest resemblance between the bread and the body of Christ, and between the wine and the blood of Christ; hence the bread and wine by a usual mode of speaking are wont to be called the body and blood of the Lord. Another mystery in this rite, which is especially simple, ought not to be looked for."*

Similar to this, I fear, is the general doctrine of Dissenters in this kingdom. Doddridge (*Rise and Progress*, c. 18) thus describes "the great ends" of the Lord's Supper. Christ "has been pleased to institute a social ordinance, in which a whole assembly of [professing Christians] is to come to his table, and there to eat the same bread and drink the same cup. And this they are to do, as a token of their affectionate remembrance of his dying love, of their solemn surrender of themselves to God, and of their sincere love to one another, and to all their fellow-christians."

I find an extract from Wesley's Letters (13th) in which some persons are reported to have said, that "they need not the Lord's Supper, for they never cease to remember Christ in the most acceptable manner."

And though the following is from an American writer, yet

the popularity in this country of the work from which it is extracted is so great, that it may be justly accepted as expressing the doctrine of English dissenters.

“It is a symbolical religious service, instituted by Christ as a commemoration of his death. It is intended, 1. To represent the great sacrifice of Christ on the cross:—2. to be a standing proof of the mission of Christ, and of the truth of the gospel, which is an account of that mission:—3. to exhibit in a strong light, the purity of Christ’s character:—4. To admonish Christians of the second coming of Christ:—5. to unite Christians in a known, public, and efficacious bond of union:—6. to be a visible and affecting pledge of Christ’s love to his followers:—7. to edify Christians in the divine life.”—Dwight’s Theology, Sermon clx.

Priestly and his followers hardly go lower. And it would appear that the doctrines of Zuingle and Limborch, of Socinus, and the so-called Unitarians, and of English dissenters generally in relation to the Eucharist, are all cast in the same mould. They may be regarded indeed, as essentially the same. Their main error is defect. And how great that defect is, will be instantly apparent, when they are brought to the touchstone of that one text of St. Paul, “the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?” (1 Cor. x. 16).*

The celebration of the Eucharist among the Anabaptists in Munster by John of Leyden (Vide Hospinian. Hist. Sac. II. 134), is a fitting precedent for exhibitions which have been sometimes made in France.

APPENDIX Q.

Referred to in p. 51. The Decree of Transubstantiation.

This decree, by which it was established, and which is transcribed in p. 51, is in flat contradiction to Pope Gelasius: for in his book against Eutyches, *De duabus naturis in Christo*, he says:—

“Eutychiani dicunt unam esse naturam, id est, Divinam;—sola existente Deitate, Humanitas illic esse jam destitit.”—
“Certe sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi Divina res est, propter quod et per eadem Divinæ efficitur consortes nature; et tamen esse

“The Eutychians say that the nature is one, that is, Divine;—the Deity alone existing, the Humanity has now ceased to be there.—Certainly, the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ which we take is a Divine thing, on account of which and through them we are made

* See Waterland’s Review, c. viii. 201–208, Oxford, 1823.

non desinit substantia vel natura Panis et Vini. Et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebratur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus, et sumimus, ut sicut in hanc, scilicet, in Divinam trans-eant, S. Spiritu perficiente, substantiam, permanentes tamen in suæ proprietate naturæ; sic illud ipsum mysterium principale, cujus nobis efficientiam virtutemque veraciter representant, ex quibus constat proprie permanentibus, unum Christum, quia integrum, verumque, permanere demonstrant.”—Contra Eutychem, cited by Pearson, Art. “Which was conceived.”

partakers of the Divine nature; and yet the substance or nature of the bread and wine does not cease to be. And certainly the image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ is celebrated in the action of the mysteries. It is there shown to us evidently enough that we must think this is the Lord Christ Himself, which in His image we profess, celebrate, and take, that as by the operation of the Holy Spirit, they pass into this, namely, a Divine substance, remaining yet in the propriety of their own nature; so that that very principal mystery, whose efficiency and virtue they truly represent to us, from which properly remaining, as it is evident, they demonstrate that one Christ, because perfect and true, remains.”

APPENDIX S.*

Referred to in p. 52.

See Chillingworth against Knot, c. iv. n. 46.

Archbishop Bramhall gives a catalogue of the “questions and debates” which arose from transubstantiation.

“Then it began, (he says,) to be disputed by what means this change comes: whether by the benediction of the elements, or by the repetition of these words of Christ, ‘This is my body.’—

“Then was the question started, what the demonstrative pronoun *Hoc* signifies in these words, ‘This is my body;’ whether this thing, or this substance, or this bread, or this body, or this meat, or these accidents, or that which is contained under these *species*, or this *individuum vagum*, or lastly (which seems stranger than all the rest) this nothing.

“Then it began to be argued, whether the elements were annihilated: whether the matter and form of them being destroyed, their essence did yet remain; or the essence being converted, the existence remained: whether the sacramental existence of the body and blood of Christ do depend upon its natural existence: whether the whole Host were transubstantiated, or only some parts of it, that is, such parts as should be distributed to worthy communicants; or whether in those parts of the Host, which were distributed unto unworthy communicants, the matter of bread and wine did not return: whether the Deity did assume the bread, or the *species* thereof, by a new hypostatical union, called *impanation*, either absolutely, or respectively *mediante corpore*: whether the body and blood of Christ might be present in the Sacrament without transubstantiation, with the bread or without the bread: whether a body

* This signature S. has occurred from an oversight, which it is hoped the reader will excuse.

may be transubstantiated into a spirit; and (which is most strange) whether a creature might be transubstantiated into the Deity.

“Then the schoolmen began to wrangle what manner of change this was, whether a material change, or a formal change; or a change of the whole substance, both matter and form, and if it were a conversion of the whole substance, then whether it was by way of *production*, or by *adduction*, or by *conservation*: each of which greater squadrons are subdivided into several lesser parties, speaking as different languages as the builders of Babel, pestering and perplexing one another with inextricable difficulties.—

“Then grew up the question, what is the proper adequate body which is contained under the *species* or accidents; whether a material body, or a substantial body, or a living body, or an organical body, or a human body; whether it have weight or not, and why it is not perceived; whether it can be seen by the eye of mortal man; whether it can act or suffer any thing: whether it be moveable or immoveable; whether by itself, or by accident, or by both; whether it can move in one place and rest in another, or be moved with two contrary motions, as upwards and downwards, southwards and northwards, at the same time.

“Add to these, whether the soul of Christ, and the Deity, and the whole Trinity, do follow the body and blood of Christ under either species, by concomitance: whether the Sacramental Body must have suffered the same things with the natural body; as supposing that an Host, consecrated at Christ's last Supper, had been reserved until after his passion, whether Christ must have died, and his blood have been actually shed, in the Sacrament; yea, whether those wounds, that were imprinted by the whips in his natural body, might and should have been found in his Sacramental body without flagellation.

“Likewise, what blood of Christ is in the Sacrament; whether that blood only which was shed, or that blood only which remained in the body, or both the one and the other; and whether that blood which was shed was assumed again by the humanity in the resurrection.

“Then began those paradoxical questions to be first agitated in the schools: whether the same individual body, without division or discontinuation from itself, can be locally in ten thousand places, yea, in heaven and in earth, at the same time; or if not locally, yet whether it can be spiritually and indivisibly; and whether it be not the same as to this purpose, whether a body be locally or spiritually present in more places than one.—

“And many such strange questions are moved:—as whether it be possible the thing contained should be a thousand times greater than the thing containing; whether a definitive being in a place do not imply a not-being out of that place; whether more bodies than one can be in one and the same place; whether there can be a penetration of dimension; whether a body can subsist after a spiritual manner, so as to take up no place at all, but to be wholly in the whole, and wholly in every part; moreover, whether the whole body and blood of Christ be in every

particle of the bread, and of the cup; and if it be, then whether only after the division of the bread and wine, or before division also; and in how many parts, and in which parts, is the whole body and blood of Christ; whether in the least parts; and if in the least parts, then whether in the least in kind or the least in quantity; that is, so long as the *species* may retain the name of bread and wine, or so long as the matter is divisible; and whether the body and blood of Christ be also in the indivisible parts, as points, and lines, and superficies: lastly, whether accidents can subsist without their subjects, that is, whether they can be both accidents, and no accidents; whether all the accidents of the elements do remain, and particularly whether the quantity doth remain; whether the other accidents do inhere in the quantity as their subject, that is, whether an accident can have an accident; whether the quantity of Christ's body be there; and whether it be there after a quantitative manner, with extension of parts, either extrinsical or intrinsical: and whether the quantity of the body of Christ be distinct and figured, or indistinct and unfigured; whether the accidents can nourish or make drunken, or corrupt, and a new body be generated of them; and what supplies the place of matter in such generation,—whether the quantity, or the body of Christ, or the old matter of the bread and wine restored by miracle, or new matter created by God; and how long in such corruption doth the body of Christ continue.”—Answer to M. de la Milletiere, Works, Oxford, 1842—1844, vol. I. 14—19.

“Noisome,” indeed, were these questions, as the Archbishop called them: and that transubstantiation generates, and requires the determination of such subtleties, appears to me no slight presumption against it. Can truth be the mother of such progeny? or be attended by such “swarms of noisome” companions?

Writers of the nineteenth century are sometimes found to decry all arguments against transubstantiation from the nature and reason of things. But few of our great divines have written on the subject without intimating or pressing objections derived from that source. I shall here merely refer to Waterland's Rev. of the Doctr. of the Eucharist, c. viii. Works, VII. 200, Oxford, 1823: Bishop Bull's Vindication of the Ch. of England, sect. 23. Works, vol. II. p. 203, Oxford, 1827, and Corruptions of the Ch. of Rome, sect. 3. Ibid. p. 253: Bishop Cosin's Hist. of Transubstantiation, III. i.; IV. ii., viii.: Hammond's Prac. Cat., VI. iv. p. 382. Oxford, 1843: Bishop Beveridge on the Thirty-nine Articles, Art. 28. Works, vol. VII. pp. 483, 484. Oxford, 1842, &c.: Barrow on the Creed, Serm. 31. Works, vol. II. p. 328. Lond. 1722. See also Bennett's Confutation

of Popery, Part 2, Chapters ii.-ix.: Moreton on the Eucharist, IV. 229.

The remarks of Archbishop Cranmer are well worth transcribing.

“The papistical doctrine is also against all our outward senses, called our five wits. For our eyes say, they see there bread and wine: our noses smell bread and wine: our mouths taste, and our hands feel bread and wine. And although the articles of our faith be *above all our outward senses*, so that we believe things which we can neither see, feel, hear, smell, nor taste; yet they be not *contrary* to our senses, at the least so contrary, that in such things which we from time to time do see, smell, feel, hear, and taste, we shall not trust the senses, but believe clean contrary. Christ never made no such article of our faith. Our faith teacheth us to believe things we see not; but it doth not bid us that we shall *not* believe that we see daily with our eyes, and hear with our ears, and grope with our hands. For although our senses cannot reach so far as our faith doth. yet *so far as the compass of our senses doth usually reach*, our faith is not contrary to the same, but rather our senses do *confirm our faith*. Or else what availed it to St. Thomas, for the confirmation of Christ’s resurrection, that he did put his hand into Christ’s side, and felt his wounds, if he might not trust his senses, nor give no credit thereto.

“And what a wide door is here open to Valentinianus, Marcion, and other heretics, which said, ‘that Christ was not crucified, but that Simon Cyrenæus was crucified for him, although to the sight of the people it seemed that Christ was crucified’? or to such heretics, as said, that Christ was no man, although to man’s sight, He appeared in the form of man, and seemed to be hungry, dry, weary, to weep, sleep, eat, drink, yea, and to die like as other men die. *For if we once admit this doctrine, that no credit is to be given to our senses, we open a large field, and give great occasion unto an innumerable rabblement of most heinous heresies.*

“And if there be no trust to be given to our senses in this matter of the sacrament, why then do the papists so stoutly affirm, that the accidents remain after the consecration, which cannot be judged but by the senses? For the scripture speaketh no word of the accidents of bread and wine, but of the bread and wine themselves. And it is against the nature and definition of accidents, to be alone without any substance. Wherefore, if we may not trust our senses in this matter of the sacrament, then if the substance of the bread and wine be gone, why may we not then say, that the accidents be gone also? And if we must needs believe our senses as concerning the *accidents* of bread and wine, why may we not do the like of the *substance*, and that rather than of the accidents: forasmuch as after the consecration, the scripture saith in no place that there is *no substance* of bread nor of wine, but calleth them still by such names as signify the substances, and not the accidents?

“And finally, if our senses be daily deceived in this matter, then is the

sensible sacrament nothing else but an illusion of our senses.”—On the Lord’s Supper, II. iv., [p. 270] pp. 255, 256. Camb. 1844. See also his *Defensio veræ et Cath. Doctr. de Sacramento*, II. iii. xiv. in the same volume.

“Could I be persuaded that my faculties are not true, but deceive me in such things as I judge most certain and evident, then I can no more believe them as to any revelation, than I can as to their natural reasonings, for the same faculties must judge of *both*; and if the faculty be *false*, I can trust its judgment in *neither*.”—General Discourses against Popery, p. 54, after Tit. VIII. vol. 2 of Tracts against Popery.

“*Miracles* are appeals to our senses, and without believing our senses, we can trust to no miracle, and consequently to no Revelation.”—Leslie’s Case stated between the Churches of Rome and England, Works, I. 517. Lond. 1721.

It has, however, been said, by one of the most strenuous opponents of Romish doctrine, Mr. Stanley Faber, that the doctrine of transubstantiation, like the doctrine of the Trinity, is a question of merely extrinsic evidence: that is, whether it be contained in Holy Scripture. But, in the first place, I must protest against the assumed parallelism of these doctrines. The doctrine of the Trinity does not, in any way, or in any respect, contradict the senses or the reason of mankind:* and its evidence is in perfect consistency with them. There is no contradiction in the doctrine, that there are three Persons and one God. It is plainly not a contradiction in terms. Neither is it a contradiction in substance: because, as it does not assert, neither does it imply, that the Divine Persons are three and one in the same respect:—it is not, that they are three Persons, and yet but one Person: nor, that they are three Gods, and yet but one God: but it is, that they are three in respect of personality, and one in respect of nature; that nature being perfect, indivisible, and eternal. And one might as well attempt to prove a contradiction in the Apostle’s statement, that God “hath made of one blood all nations of men” (Acts xvii. 26), as to prove a contradiction in this doctrine. It is only in perversions or misrepresentations of the doctrine, that contradictions are to be found. Nor has all the wit, or all the philosophy of man, ever yet been able to show, that there is any impossibility in the fact which the doctrine of the Trinity asserts.

But when we read in so many places of Scripture, that the Father is God, that the Son is God, that the Holy Ghost is

* See the 1st and 3rd of the Bampton Lectures for 1837.

God, and that there is but one God: as we know of ourselves that contradictories cannot both be true, and yet are most certainly assured that these propositions are all true; so we take them and interpret them in one consistent sense, as expressing diversity of person, identity of nature, and unity of substance. As there are revealed to us Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and we know of ourselves that the Father who begat, is not the Son, whom He has begotten; and the Spirit who is sent, is not He who sent him: so, believing that "there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost; and acknowledging every Person by himself;" as the Holy Scripture teaches us, "to be God and Lord;"* we also believe that they are not three Gods or three Lords; but one God and one Lord. Thus "the whole body" of this doctrine is "fitly joined together," if we may so speak, "and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part unto the edifying of" the Church of God. (Eph. iv. 16.)

It is, therefore, I would hope, perfectly clear, that the questions of impossibility and contradiction must be entertained, either as a distinct substantive objection against the doctrine; or as determining the principles, on which the evidence of Scripture in relation to it is to be interpreted.

Consubstantiation affirms the impossibility of transubstantiation; and the impossibility of both is implied by our Church.

I know it has been said, that as the doctrine of transubstantiation cannot be proved from the Scriptures, we have no need of any intrinsic arguments to disprove it: no necessity of discussing the possibility or impossibility of the fact, or the contradictions and inconsistencies of the doctrine. But such arguments cannot be avoided; or, if avoided, they will nevertheless be implied. Besides, there is great use in a variety of arguments or reasons, for the establishment of any truth: because the minds of men are so various, that some are more clearly convinced in one way, some in another. And as no one who remembers the divine canon of interpretation, that spiritual things are to be compared with spiritual,—(1 Cor. ii. 13) will usually think it sufficient to produce one text which may be plainly for or against any doctrine: but will cite at least as many texts as he thinks will fairly show the mind of Scripture:

* Athanasian Creed.

so no man who aims at truth will reject any argument by which it may be discovered, illustrated, or confirmed. Truth fears neither reason nor argument, provided it only be in charity. And since "truth in what kind soever," as it has been rightly observed, "is by no truth gainsaid:" we may be sure that natural truth is never opposed by supernatural. Most certain it is, that our capacities are weak and narrow, and by no means to be trusted, or even allowed to speak, out of their own province: but this is no reason why they should be utterly discredited and silenced within its bounds. And let it never be forgotten, that nature, so far as it goes, agrees with revelation; for both are of God. It is He, therefore, who speaks in them: and when He speaks, faith will hear.

APPENDIX R.

Referred to in p. 53. The Church of Rome, while maintaining that the substance of the bread and wine do not remain, yet acknowledged that the species may still be called bread and wine.

"Ipse Dominus dixit: *Hoc est corpus meum*: vocis enim, *hoc*, ea vis est, ut omnem rei præsentis substantiam demonstret; quod si panis substantia remaneret, nullo modo vere dici videretur: Hoc est corpus meum.

"Cum ergo tam claris et perspicuis verbis" (S. Johan. v. 52, 54, 56) "carnem suam panem et cibum verum; sanguinem item verum potum nominaverit, satis videtur declarasse nullam in Sacramento substantiam panis et vini remanere." Cat. Con. Trid. II. iv. 37.

"Moneant pastores hoc loco mirandum non esse, si post consecrationem panis etiam vocetur: hoc enim nomine Eucharistia appellari consuevit: tum quia panis speciem habeat, tum quia naturalem alendi et nutriendi corporis vim quæ panis propria est, adhuc retineat. Eam autem esse sacrarum litterarum consuetudinem, ut res ita appellet, cujusmodi esse videntur, satis ostendit quod in Genesi dictum est, tres viros Abrahamæ apparuisse, qui tamen tres angeli erant."—Ibid. 38.

"The Lord himself said; This is my body: for such is the force of the word, this, that it shows the whole substance of a present thing; but if the substance of the bread remained, it would seem to be in no way truly said: This is my body.

"Since therefore in so clear and plain words, He called his flesh bread and meat indeed, his blood likewise drink indeed: He seems sufficiently to have declared that no substance of bread and wine remains in this Sacrament.

"Here let the pastors warn them that they must not wonder, if it be still called bread after consecration: for by this name the Eucharist has been wont to be called; as well because it has the species of bread, as because it yet retains the natural power of sustaining and nourishing the body, which belongs to bread. That moreover, such is the custom of Holy Scripture, that it calls things such as they appear to be, that which is said in Genesis sufficiently shews, that three men appeared to Abraham, who, however, were three angels."

"[The Church of Rome] hath indeed no 'breaking of bread' at all. For it being broken ever after it is consecrated, there is with them no bread remaining to break; and the body of Christ is now impassable and cannot be broken; so that they are fain to say they break accidents, and

indeed they well know not what. Contrary to St. Luke here, (Acts ii. 42) who calleth it *fractionem panis*, and to St. Paul, (1 Cor. x. 16) who saith, *Panis quem frangimus.*—*Bishop Andrewes's Sermons.* Library of Ang. Cath. Theology, Vol. V. p. 66, on Acts ii. 42.

APPENDIX S.

Referred to in p. 88. On our Lord's coming out of the tomb : on his entering the room when the doors were shut : and on his vanishing out of sight at Emmaus.

It may be well to make some remarks upon these occurrences ; since from them an indefinite apprehension is sometimes manifested by members of our Church, that the body of Christ may be literally and substantially present in the Sacrament.

1. The Evangelists relate that the tomb in which the body of our Lord was laid, was hewn out of a rock ; that the door of it was closed up with a very great stone ;* and that a seal was put upon the stone to make the tomb sure. And it is imagined by some, † that when He rose, He passed bodily out of the tomb, after the manner of a spirit, while it was still closed, and the seal was unbroken.

But I would ask the student to refer to the narratives of the Resurrection in the Gospels, and examine for himself what traces or proofs of the alleged miracle are to be found there.

A comparison of the four Gospels will give this train of circumstances.—“In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary went” ‡ forth from the place where they had lodged, § “to see the sepulchre.” ||

* “According to Beza's copy of St. John's Gospel, twenty men could hardly roll the stone.”—West on the Resurrection, Sect. iv.—λίθον, ὃν μόγις εἰκοσι ἐκύλιον. See Scholz. N. Test. Gr. Luke xxiii. 53.

† Bellarmine (De Euch. III. vi.) quietly assumes it ; and advances it as one of his proofs “that a body may be in some place, and not occupy a place” ! Aquinas says, that “it is not possible for one body to be in more places than one locally, no, not by miracle, because it implies a contradiction.” Bramhall, I. 18. And Bellarmine says, that “without doubt, if a body cannot be in two places locally, it cannot be sacramentally in two places.”—Ibid.

‡ ἤλαθε : see Luke xv. 20 : John vi. 17 : Acts xxviii. 14.

§ See Townson on the Resurrection, Obs. on Sect. 3, pp. 77, 78, and on Sect. 6, pp. 143, &c.

|| Matt. xxxviii. 1.

In proceeding thither, they called for Salome, or were joined by her.*

But before they reached the sepulchre,† “there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.”‡

It was dark when they set out;§ but the sun was risen || when “they came to the sepulchre.”

“When,” therefore, “they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away.”¶

And having entered into the sepulchre,** they were told by the angel, that the Lord was risen. ††

This is a simple outline of the facts: and it is impossible to discover, either from any one of the Gospels, or from any combination of their accounts, the faintest trace of the supposed miracle, that our Lord passed out of the tomb before the stone had been rolled away. We know not, indeed, but that He could have so passed out: and we are certain that the stone could no more have impeded his passage, than the water could have refused to bear Him. But we are not informed by the only authority sufficient to assure us, nor led by it to imagine, that He left the tomb while it was still closed, passing through the substance of the stone. There is absolute and impenetrable silence on this point. And it may be asserted, in equal consistency with the inspired narrative, that when He came forth, the door had been opened for him, in a way so befitting to his Majesty, and at the same time to the condition of his humanity, as is related by St. Matthew. As at his death, “the earth did quake” and “the sun was darkened.”‡‡ So again also the earth did quake, when she travailed with the reviving Saviour; and the sun arose, when the First-begotten from the dead came forth to give new life and hope to the world.

But in the present connection, notice may be taken merely of this one fact: that the tomb was opened, before the Resur-

* Mark xvi. 1. † The stone had been rolled away before they came, Mark xvi. 4: Luke xxiv. 2. ‡ Matt. xxviii. 2.
 § John xx. 1. || ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου: Mark xvi. 2. orto jam sole: Vulg. See Matt. xiii. 6: Mark iv. 6.—“Hæ igitur, dum capiunt consilium, dum moliuntur, dum itineri se accingunt, dum cunctantur, et modo plures, modo pauciores ad monumentum accedunt, nox præterit, illo anni tempore non longissima.”—Casaubon, Exercit. ad Baron. XVI. An. xxxiv. Num. 170, Genev. 1655, p. 593.
 ¶ Mark xvi. 4. ** Mark xvi. 6; Luke xxiv. 3. For a description of the sepulchre, see Townson, p. 80.
 †† Mark xvi. 6: Luke xxiv. 6. ‡‡ Matt. xxvii. 51 Luke xxiii. 45.

rection was announced :—that all of the Evangelists tell us that the stone was rolled away—St. Matthew in particular telling us how,—before they speak of the Resurrection. And this, without more, is sufficient to shew that our Lord might have passed out when it was opened.

Nor is the circumstance to be overlooked, that of the events of the evening of the Crucifixion, this was one :—“the tombs—*μνημεῖα*—were opened ; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the tombs, after his resurrection and appeared unto many.” Matt. xxvii. 51–53. It is a question which it is, perhaps, impossible to decide with certainty, whether these saints rose again with their natural and mortal bodies, being merely restored to life again, as in the case of Lazarus and others, or with their resurrection bodies, spiritual and immortal. All the other cases of restoration to life, related in the Gospels, and the Acts, were doubtless a re-animation of the natural body : and those who were subjects of the miracle, would necessarily be visible to all others. But of the bodies of these saints, the Evangelist says, that they “appeared unto many” (*ἐνεφανίσθησαν*). And this seems to me to intimate a very important and perhaps decisive, distinction between their resurrection and the dead whom our Lord in his ministry and the Apostles raised. If St. Matthew had used the word *ὤφθησαν*, he might have meant, either that they were seen, or that they became visible ; for it has both senses : but, according to New-Testament use, the word he used has, I think, more properly, the latter meaning, namely, “became visible” or “were made manifest.” See John xiv. 21, 22. In the other places where the word occurs (Acts xxiii. 15, 22 ; xxiv. 1 ; xxv. 2, 15 ; Heb. ix. 24 ; xi. 14) it signifies to shew, declare, or manifest something which would not otherwise have been seen or known. I incline therefore strongly to the opinion that if these saints had risen from the dead, as Lazarus and the others had been raised, the Evangelist would have said *ὤφθησαν* : and that in saying, *ἐνεφανίσθησαν*, he intimated a condition of their bodies which would not be visible, as the bodies of those who had not died, or had been merely reanimated. A natural body must have been seen, but the resurrection and spiritual body might be present, but not seen.

If I am right, as I think I am, in this criticism, it has a very obvious bearing on the question before us. The tombs were opened for the bodies of these saints. Was the tomb opened for our Lord’s body, or did He, with it and in it, penetrate

through the substance of the unmoved stone? If we cannot say that He did not, we cannot say that He did. If their bodies were their resurrection bodies, they would be like unto His glorious body, and would have somewhat of its power.

2. St. John says,* that in the evening after the Resurrection, “the doors having been shut (*κεκλεισμένων*), where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst:” and that “after eight days again,—came Jesus, the doors having been shut, and stood in the midst:” and because the mode of his entrance is not stated by the Evangelist, it is assumed that He penetrated through the substance of the doors, as light through glass, without opening them, or displacing any part of them. “But that they were closed in the instant of his entry, it says not.”†

Now that his entrance was miraculous, cannot be denied:—that He came in, that is, without any one opening the door for Him. But could He not open it for Himself? causing it to open of its own accord, as the iron gate opened for Peter? ‡

This is, at least, as consistent with the account in the Gospel, as the other. Nay it is much more: for the passage through the substance of the closed doors would have counteracted the purpose for which our Lord thus appeared to his disciples. He came to convince them of his resurrection. For what could all the proofs which He gave them, by allowing them to handle and feel Him, and by eating before them, have availed; if by the manner in which He came, He had taught them to doubt the very senses, by which the reality and identity of his body were to be judged? “He shewed unto them his hands, and his side,§ and his feet,” saying: Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have”:|| and He said “to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side.”¶ “Yet this supposed penetration through the doors destroys both these arguments; it being as certain that flesh and bones cannot penetrate through a door,** as that a spirit hath not flesh and bones; and that his body must have passed through the doors after the manner of a spirit, as that it after-

* Chap. xx. 19, 26.

† Acts xii. 10.

|| Luke xxiv. 39.

‡ See Taylor on the Real Presence, xi. s. 50.

§ John xx. 20.

¶ John xx. 27.

** See Suicer sub voce *θύρα*.

ward appeared after the manner of a body; and that the same power which made a natural body penetrate through a door, could make a phantasm or aerial body appear like flesh and bones to the touch, and seem to have the marks and prints of a crucified body: so that unless our Saviour designed to invalidate the strength of what He said and did to convince them of the truth of his resurrection, He could not at the same time do a thing known to them, which did evacuate the force of all his proofs. Nor would this evangelist have twice recorded this circumstance, when speaking of the Resurrection, had he imagined the words bore such a sense, as turned his body into spirit, and ministered occasion to all that read it, to suspect the strength of any of these arguments to confirm this fundamental article."*

And that our Lord, having opened and shut the doors, should be standing in the midst of them, before they may have perceived Him, is in no way wonderful. It was a large upper room in which they were assembled:† and while the disciples were engaged in earnest conference on the events and reports of that illustrious day, with the feeling of security from having fastened the doors, perhaps both of the room and of the entrance to the house; one even of their own number, if he could have opened the doors, might have approached them, without being perceived till he stood in the midst of them.

When our Lord entered the room, the disciples "supposed that they had seen a spirit" (Luke xxiv. 37); because they thought that He had come in, as a spirit is supposed to come: but He instantly corrected their mistake; showing them that it was a body, as real as He ever had, as real as theirs: and consequently, that He had entered as a body must enter. For if this does not follow, they could have no proof of the reality of his body; because neither sight nor feeling could have proved it, if counterbalanced by the opposing fact, that He had come as a spirit only could come. They could not believe both, for both could not be true of a real human body. Which, then, could they believe?—the reality of the body which they saw and felt; or that which in ignorance and haste they had only supposed? We know that they were taught to apprehend and believe the former; and consequently neither did they, on second thoughts, believe, nor was it true, that their Lord had

* Whitby; John xx. 19. See also West on the Resurrection, sect. 16.

† See Appendix A.

entered the room where they were sitting, in any way contrary to the nature of a true body.

I do not overlook the circumstance, that some of the Fathers were of a different opinion, as to the manner of his entrance. Some thought that his body was so far changed at his resurrection, as to have put off the properties of a body, and to have taken the properties of a spirit: others, that by a change for the moment only, becoming of a subtile nature, it penetrated through the opposing substances.*

* See Suicer sub voce. *ἀνάστασις*, II. A. 1, and *θήρα*, I.: August. de Agone Christiano, xxiv. or his Short Treatises in the Lib. of the Fathers, p. 178, and Homil. on St. John, c. xx. v. 19. No. CXXI. p. 1056.

St. Augustine, for example, says:

“*Non audiendi, qui negant tale corpus Domini resurrexisse, quale fuerit sepultum. Nec eos audiamus, qui negant tale corpus Domini resurrexisse, quale positum est in monumento. Si enim tale non fuisset, non ipse dixisset post resurrectionem discipulis: Palpate, et videte, quoniam spiritus ossa et carnem non habet, sicut me videtis habere. Luc. xxiv. 39. Sacrilegum est enim credere Dominum nostrum, cum ipse sit Veritas, in aliquo fuisse mentium. Nec nos moveat quod clausis ostiis subito eum apparuisse discipulis scriptum est (Joan. xx. 26), ut propterea negemus illud fuisse corpus humanum, quia contra naturam hujus corporis videmus esse per clausa ostia intrare. Omnia enim possibilia sunt Deo (Matt. ix. 26). Nam et ambulare super aquas contra naturam hujus corporis esse manifestum est; et tamen non solum ipse Dominus ante passionem ambulavit, sed etiam Petrum ambulare fecit (Id. xiv. 25, 26). Ita ergo et post resurrectionem de corpore suo fecit quod voluit. Si enim potuit ante passionem clarificare illud sicut splendorem solis (Id. xvii. 2); quare non potuit et post passionem ad quantam vellet subtilitatem in temporis momento redigere, ut per clausa ostia posset intrare?*”—De Agone Christiano, xxiv.; Migne, vi. 304.

It is certainly clear, that St. Augustine thought the passage of our Lord's body through the substance of the closed doors, possible: but he did not assert that it did so pass. And he illustrates the possibility by the fact that our Lord Himself walked, and made Peter walk, on the waters, contrary to the nature of the human body. But was it not contrary also to the nature of water? If it was contrary to the nature of the human body, not to sink in the water; it was as contrary to the nature of water to bear it on its surface. And there is nothing in the sacred history to enable us to decide in which way nature was suspended: whether the nature of the water was overruled for the time, or whether our Lord overruled the nature of His own body, and Peter's.

Dr. Pusey, indeed, after the example of others before him, refers to sixteen or seventeen of the ancient Fathers from the latter part of the fourth century onwards, in testimony of the assertion that the passage of our Lord out of the tomb, and His

“Nor are they to be heard, who deny that such a body of the Lord rose again as was buried. Nor let us listen to them who deny that there arose such a body of the Lord as was placed in the tomb. For if it had not been such, He Himself would not have said to the disciples: Handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not bones and flesh, as ye see me have.

“For it is sacrilegious to believe that our Lord, since He is the Truth, hath in anything lied. Nor let it move us, that it is written, that when the doors were shut, He suddenly appeared to the disciples, that therefore we should deny it to have been a human body, because we see it to be contrary to the nature of this body to enter through closed doors. For all things are possible with God. For it is manifest that to walk upon the waters also is contrary to the nature of this body; and yet not only did the Lord Himself walk [on the waters] before His passion; but He also caused Peter so to walk.

“Thus therefore also after the resurrection He made of His own body what He would. For if before His passion He could make that body to shine as the brightness of the sun; why could He not also after His passion reduce it to so great subtility in a moment of time, so that it could enter through closed doors.”

But, without entering into questions, which would needlessly extend this note,—though to state them is almost to determine them in the negative,—it is enough to say, that a “consent of the Fathers” cannot be shown for the notion, that our Lord’s body passed through the substance of the closed doors: that, therefore, this notion is a matter of mere individual opinion: and, consequently, that it may be accepted or rejected, without any disrespect to the authorities in its favour, according to probability and evidence. What the evidence in the case is, the foregoing observations show. The direct evidence of Scripture deposes to the fact, of our Lord’s coming into the room though the doors had been shut: while, on the one hand, the notion in question is but a mode, and not the necessary mode, of accounting for that fact; and, on the other,—since it contradicts or, at least, seems to contradict, the truth of the Lord’s body,—the indirect evidence of Scripture, and probability, are against it. It is nothing like a case in which the Fathers, properly so called, are unanimous, and in which their consent tallies with Scripture.

The assertion, then, that our Lord passed through the substance of the closed doors has no sufficient warrant, and is much too confident.

3. When our Lord made Himself known to the two disciples at Emmaus, “in breaking of bread;” it is said, that “He vanished out of their sight.”* But these words do not express the original with sufficient accuracy:—*ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ’ αὐτῶν*—which the margin better renders by, He ceased to be seen of them. It means nothing more.

It is not explained how He ceased to be seen of them. Most probably,—indeed, we may say, certainly,—it was in some miraculous way. But as the words of the Evangelist are strictly limited to the assertion of our Lord’s disappearance, it

entrance, when the doors were shut, was through the substance of the unmoved stone, and of the closed doors: but the opinion of a hundred Fathers is not sufficient to establish the fact, in the utter silence of Scripture. The alleged facts may be possible and probable: but they can be no foundation for doctrine. And the opinion of St. Augustine, that our Lord could reduce his body to such a condition of subtilty as to enable it to pass through the closed doors, does not in my mind help the allegation. I prefer to think that our Lord’s miraculous power was exerted on the water, on the stone, and on the doors, and not in a change on his own body, or that of Peter.

St. Jerome said it was “by the creature yielding to the Creator: *creatura cedente Creatori.*” And St. Cyril of Alexandria declared that it is impossible for body to pass through body, without cutting it or being cut: *ἀδύνατον σῶμα διὰ σώματος δῆκειν μὴ τέμνον καὶ τεμνόμενον.*”

* Luke xxiv. 31.

is impossible to determine in what respect it was miraculous. We can, therefore, only form suppositions, more or less probable.

But the supposition, that our Lord vanished after the manner of a spirit, is not probable: because, as the perversions of the heretic, and the cavils of the unbeliever, plainly warn us, it opposes the truth of his body; and weakens, if it does not annul, the proofs of his resurrection.

Neither has it any precedent in Scripture. In the visions of God, and of angels, which are there so frequently recorded,* this mode of disappearance is never once intimated. And this observation will apply more forcibly to the present case, when we remember: that it was not the Father, but the Son,† who at any time appeared to man:—that the angelic visions in the Old Testament were, generally, not of any created angels, but of the same divine Person, by whom the Father hath been declared:‡ and that, as is frequently expressed, and for the most part to be necessarily inferred, it was in the human form He appeared. For if, when it was, as yet, but the appearance of our form which He took, it is never once intimated that He ceased to be seen by vanishing like a spirit out of sight: how much less may it be supposed, that He would thus disappear, after He had taken into an inseparable union with his divine majesty, not merely the form, but the reality, of our nature!

There were, in fact, during his manifestation in the flesh, several instances somewhat similar to this disappearance at Emmaus. On four different occasions, when his enemies were on the point of laying hands upon Him, or when He was likely to be in danger from them, it is stated that “He, passing through the midst of them, went his way:” † that He “conveyed himself away” § out of the multitude: that He “hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst

* Frequently as in Gen. iii. 8: Exod. iii. 4: Josh. v. 13—vi. 5: Dan. iii. 25: Luke, i. 20, we do not hear how the vision ended. But sometimes there is distinct intimation of it. In Gen. xvii. 22—xxxv. 13—xviii. 33: Num. xii. 9: Jud. vi. 21: xiii. 20: Luke, i. 38—ii. 15: Acts, xii. 10; it is by a local departure. It is even said that Satan, “when he had ended all his temptations, *departed*” from our Lord. Luke iv. 13. There is not one precedent in the Scriptures for the notion of our Lord’s vanishing like a spirit out of sight. It seems rather to have been derived from the fables of heathen mythology or poetic fiction, than to rest upon any scriptural foundation.

† John i. 18. See Bampton Lectures for 1837, pp. 80, &c. 234, &c. 126—140.

‡ Luke vi. 30.

§ John v. 13—*ἐξένευσεν*—“Casaubon observes, that this word,—being a metaphor borrowed from swimming, signifies that he glided through the multitude, leaving no trace behind him of the way he had taken.”—Macknight’s Harmony, sect. 45.

of them, and so passed by :” * and that “ He went out of their hands.” † And here again, there is nothing of vanishing out of sight: though a mythological or superstitious fancy would have suggested it, as the most natural and ready mode of escape for one possessed of so great power. But his thoughts were not so: neither did the economy ‡ of his person permit it: for his coming in the flesh was not a mere personification, which might be varied, suspended, or laid aside, and taken up again, as occasion might seem to require; but a being made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted. And, as “ a spirit hath not flesh and bones,” as we know He had after His resurrection; neither has the human body the subtilty or capacities of a spirit.

But it may be asked: in what other way, then, is it possible to conceive of his disappearance? I have before shown, that we are not informed, and, consequently, that it is not possible to determine how it was. But, so far as probability goes, there are the previous instances to which we have referred, and the circumstances of the case itself; to furnish an answer both to the unbeliever, and to the misbeliever; as well as to satisfy the modest enquiries of the devout. A body will disappear to one, if the rays of light from it be intercepted, or if he will even close his eyes. And He who could “ still the raging of the sea,” could also change or suspend the properties of the air, so as to prevent his person from being seen through it. Or, as we are informed, that, at first, the eyes of the disciples were “ holden that they should not know him;” but that afterwards they “ were opened and they knew him :” § we may reasonably and innocently imagine that they might again be holden that they should not *see* him.

On the whole, then, a miracle there was confessedly in all the three cases. But the question is, in what each miracle consisted:—how it was that our Lord passed out of the sepulchre; how he entered the room; how he ceased to be seen. And there is no evidence to show, that it was by penetrating through the stone or the solid rock; by insinuating himself

* Jehn viii. 59.

† Ibid. x. 89.—ἐξῆλθεν.—Chap. xii. 36, is perhaps another instance of miraculous disappearance or removal.

‡ See *Suicer* sub voce *οἰκονομία*.

§ Luke xxiv. 16, 31.

through the substance of the doors; or by vanishing, as a spirit is supposed to vanish, out of sight.

In the Resurrection, a sufficient miracle is related:—the stone being rolled away by an angel, is enough to show how it was that our Lord came forth. Another miracle, therefore, is unnecessary: and as no other is related, so no other is necessary to be believed. We have seen how groundless and inconsistent is the supposition that He passed through the substance of the doors: while in full agreement with the truth of his body, and with all the known facts, we can suppose, that by his divine power, the doors opened of their own accord for his admission. One of the two suppositions is necessary: but while this is probable in itself, and sufficient for all the purposes of the case; the other which we reject, is insufficient and self-contradictory. For it is not supposed, that the doors for the moment became pervious to our Lord; but that his body passed, not as a body must pass, but as a spirit only could: and so, that it was, and was not a body. And we have also seen, that the notion of his disappearing after the supposed fashion of a spirit, has no foundation in Scripture; that it is at variance not only with all scriptural precedent, but with his own previous method both before and after his coming in the flesh: and that it is adverse to his incarnation and resurrection: while other ways in which He might cease to be seen have been suggested, which are both probable in themselves, and in agreement with all the conditions of the case. We know indeed that our Lord's body was a spiritual body when He rose: and as we do not know what the powers of a spiritual body may be, we may readily believe such wonders of it, as may be surely made known to us: though a spiritual body is still a body, and subject to the laws which govern all bodies, earthly and spiritual. Dr. Hook, in a sermon at Chichester, September 25, 1859, well said in effect, that before His death, our Lord several times became invisible, and after His resurrection several times became visible: a miracle being in both cases; a miracle to be invisible in his earthly body, and a miracle to be visible in His spiritual body. But though spiritual, it could be touched and felt, and did eat. Our Lord Himself has also taught us that there is a difference between a spirit and a spiritual body: "a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have."

The alleged miracles might be believed if they had been clearly declared: but they are not so declared.

And, after all; even if it could be probably shown, or if it had been clearly declared, that our Lord passed out of the tomb before it was opened, or penetrated through the substance of the doors, or vanished like a spirit out of sight: it could have no effect upon the doctrine of the Eucharist. For probability is no proof of doctrine: and doctrine must be founded, not on probability, but on the certain warrant of God's word.

And lastly; though we were to admit the suppositions which we have rejected as not having sufficient warrant, it would not in the least prove that our Lord's body can be in more places than one; or help to show that the body of Christ could be literally and substantially present in the Sacrament. For though a spirit is so much more subtile than a material body; and a body supposed to move like a spirit, may also be supposed to have inconceivable rapidity of motion, and the power of intimate penetration into and under other substances; yet no finite body can, in its very substance, be in more places than one at the same time. If it can, why not in many places? why not everywhere? and so the finite would be, not finite, but infinite.

The object with which the suppositions in question are advanced by Romanists and others; as well as the conclusion to which they may seem to lead; is, that the Body of Christ may be believed to come into, and to be in, the bread, or under its species, in like manner as it is supposed to have vanished out of sight, to have penetrated through the doors, and to have passed through the solid rock. If it could pass through them it could also remain in them: and if in them, then also in the bread. Such is the pith of the argument. But how shall this serve the purpose, until it shall be proved, that the body of Christ is not all the while in heaven: that He is not ever sitting there at the right hand of God: and that the Sacrament is never at the same point of time in any but one place?

“Noli itaque dubitare ibi nunc esse hominem Christum Jesum, unde venturus est, memoriterque recole et fideliter tene Christianam confessionem, quoniam *resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cælum, sedet ad dextram Patris, nec aliunde quam inde venturus est ad vivos quatuordecim judicandos*. Et sic venturus est, illa angelica voce testante, *quemadmodum vivus est in cælum*, id est, in eadem carnis

“*Be unwilling therefore to doubt that the man Christ Jesus is now there from whence He is to come, and from your memory renew and keep the Christian confession, that He rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and from no other place than from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And He shall so come, as that angelic voice testi-*

forma atque substantia, cui profecto immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit. Secundum hanc formam non est putandus ubique diffusus. Cavendum est enim, ne ita divinitatem astruamus hominis, ut veritatem corporis auferamus. Non est autem consequens ut quod in Deo est sit ubique ut Deus.—Una enim persona Deus et homo est, et utrumque unus Christus: ubique per id quod Deus est, in cælo per id quod homo.”—Aug. Epist. (ad Dard. de Præsentia Dei) clxxxvii. Bened. (al. lvii.) Lib. I. C. iii. Part viii.

fies, in like manner as He was seen to go into heaven, that is, in the same form and substance of flesh, to which indeed He gave immortality, but did not take away its nature. In regard to this form He is not to be thought diffused everywhere. For we must take heed, lest we so lay down the divinity of the man, as to take away the truth of his body. Now it does not follow that that which is in God, is everywhere as God. For one person is God and man, and both are one Christ: everywhere in the respect that He is God, [but] in heaven in respect that He is man.”

APPENDIX T.

Referred to in p. 92. Consubstantiation.

Luther thus expresses his doctrine:—

“Nostra autem sententia est, corpus ita vel in pane esse, ut revera cum pane manducetur; et quemcumque motum vel actionem panis habet, eundem et corpus Christi: ut corpus Christi vere dicatur ferri, dari, accipi, manducari, quando panis fertur, datur, accipitur, manducatur. Id est, *Hoc est corpus meum.*”—Cogitationes MS. CCCC. apud Johnson. Unbloody Sacrifice, C. II. Sec. 1. Works, Oxford, 1847. Vol. i. p. 311.

“Est autem mæe sententiæ ratio magna, imprimis illa, quod verbis divinis non est ulla facienda vis, neque per hominem, neque per angelum; sed quantum fieri potest, in simplicissima significatione servanda sunt, et nisi manifesta circumstantia cogat, extra grammaticam et propriam accipienda non sunt, ne detur adversariis occasio Scripturam eludendi.—Cum Evangelistæ clare scribant, Christum accepisse panem ac benedixisse; et Actorum liber et Paulus Apostolus panem deinceps appellat; verum oportet intelligi panem, verumque vinum, sicut verum calicem. Non enim calicem transubstantiari etiam ipsi dicunt. Transubstantiationem vero, potestate divina factam, cum non sit necesse poni, pro figmento humanæ opinionis haberi, quia nulli Scripturæ, nulli rationi nititur.

“But our opinion is, that the body is even in the bread in such sort, that it is actually eaten with the bread: and that whatsoever motion or action the bread has, the body of Christ also has the same; so that the body of Christ may be truly said to be carried, given, received, eaten, when the bread is carried, given, received, eaten. That is, This is my body.”

“But that especially is the great principle of my opinion, that no violence is to be done to the divine words, neither by man, nor by angel; but as far as can be done, they are to be kept in the most simple signification, and unless a manifest circumstance compel it, they are not to be taken out of their grammatical and proper signification, lest occasion be given to our adversaries of eluding Scripture. When the Evangelists clearly write, that Christ took bread and blessed it; and the book of the Acts and the Apostle Paul, successively call it bread; it is necessary that the bread should be understood to be true bread, and the wine true wine, as [we understand] that it was a true cup. For even they themselves do not say that the cup is transubstantiated. But transubstantiation, wrought by divine power, as it is not necessary to be laid down, is to be accounted for a figment of human opinion, because it rests on no Scripture, no reason.

“Absurda est ergo, et nova verborum impositio, panem pro specie vel accidentibus panis, vinum pro specie vel accidentibus vini, accipi. Cur non et omnia

“It is therefore an absurd and novel imposition of words, that bread should be taken for the species or accidents of bread, wine for the species or accidents of

etiam pro speciebus et accidentibus accipiunt?—De Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesie, Opp. Jene, 1600. Tom. II. Pars i. pp. 263, 264.

“Tandem stabilivi conscientiam meam sententia priore, Esse videlicet, verum panem verumque vinum, in quibus Christi vera caro verusque sanguis non aliter nec minus sit, quam illi sub accidentibus ponunt.”—Ibid. p. 263.

“Sicut ergo in Christo res so habet, ita et in Sacramento. Non enim ad corporalem inhabitationem divinitatis necesse est transubstantiari humanam naturam, ut divinitas sub accidentibus humanæ naturæ teneatur. Sed integra utraque natura vere dicitur: Hic homo est Deus, hic Deus est homo. Quod etsi philosophia non capit, fides tamen capit. *Et major est verbi Dei autoritas, quam nostri ingenii capacitas.* Ita in sacramento, ut verum corpus verusque sanguis sit, non est necesse, panem et vinum transubstantiari, ut Christus sub accidentibus teneatur. Sed utroque simul manente, vere dicitur: Hic panis est corpus meum, hoc vinum est sanguis meus, et e contra.”—Ibid. p. 264.

“Nulla manducatio vivificat, nisi fidei. Hæc enim est vere spiritualis et viva manducatio. Sicut et Augustinus dicit: *Quid paras ventrem et dentem? crede et manducasti.* Sacramentalis enim non vivificat, cum multi manducant indigne.”—De Cap. Bab. Eccl. p. 261.

“Non recte faciunt, tam Sacramentarii, quam Glossa Decretorum, cum Nicolaum Papam reprehendunt; quod Berengarium adigit ad hanc confessionem, qua dicit, se atterere suis dentibus verum corpus Christi. Utinam omnes Papæ tam Christiane in omnibus partibus egissent, quam hic Papa egit cum Berengario in hac confessione.”—Confessio Major an. 1528, apud Hospinian. Hist. Sacrament. Tiguri, 1602, Pars ii. p. 8.

“Cur autem non possit Christus corpus suum intra substantiam panis continere, sicut in accidentibus? Ecce ignis et ferrum duæ substantiæ, sic miscentur in ferro ginito,† ut quælibet pars sit ferrum et

wine. *For why do they not take all likewise for species and accidents?**”

“*At length I have settled my conscience in the former opinion, namely, That it is true bread and true wine, in which the true flesh and the true blood of Christ, is not otherwise or less, than they put them under the accidents.*”

“*As therefore the case is in [the person] of Christ, so also in the Sacrament. For, to a corporal indwelling of the Divinity it is not necessary that the human nature should be transubstantiated in order that the Divinity should be contained under the accidents of the human nature. But each nature being entire, it is truly said: This man is God, this God is man.* Which, although philosophy does not receive it, yet faith receives. And greater is the authority of the word of God, than the capacity of our understanding. So in the Sacrament, in order that there be the true body and the true blood, it is not necessary that the bread and the wine should be transubstantiated, for Christ to be contained under the accidents. But both at the same time remaining, it is truly said: This bread is my body, this wine is my blood, and vice versâ.*”

“*No manducation quickens, but that of faith. For this is the truly spiritual and living manducation. As also Augustine says: Why preparest thou thy stomach and tooth? believe and thou hast eaten. For sacramental [eating only] does not quicken, since many eat unworthily.*”

“*They do not well, both Sacramentaries and the Gloss of the Decretals, when they blame Pope Nicholas, because he forced Berenger to this confession, in which he says, that he ground the true body of Christ with his teeth. Would that all the Popes had acted so christianly in all respects, as this Pope acted with Berenger in this confession.*”

“*But why may not Christ contain his body within the substance of the bread, as well as in the accidents? Behold the two substances, fire and iron, are so mingled in glowing iron that every part is*

* The views of Luther on the person of Christ, seem not to have been always free from error.

† The same comparison was made in the eighth century by John Damascen: He made two distinct substances in [the Eucharist]; *true bread and wine* still remaining in [it], and *Christ's Divine* or glorified *body and blood* united to them, or there existent with them. For he compares them (*Orthodox. Fid.* l. IV. c. xiv.) *to the coal that toucht Esaiak's lips, and saith, as that was not ξύλον λιτόν, plain or common wood, but wood united to fire; so bread at the communion is not, ἄρτος λιτὸς, plain bread, but united, θεότητι, to Divinity, (or as he called it a little before) τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου*

ignis. Cur non multo magis corpus gloriosum Christi, sic in omni parte substantiæ panis esse possit?"—De Capt. Bab. Eecl. p. 264 a.

"Corpus Christi sic salvo pane in Sacramento est, sicut est ignis in ferro salva ferri substantia, et Deus in homine, salva humanitate; utrobique sic mixtis substantiis, ut sua cuique operatio et natura propria maneat, at tamen unum aliquod constituent."—Contra Regem Angliæ.

The confession of Augsburg is more reserved; and is so free from the peculiarities of the Lutheran doctrine, on this subject, that even Calvin subscribed it. It says:—

"De cœna Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuuntur vescentibus in cœna Domini."—Art. x.

"Damnant illos qui docent, quod sacramenta ex opere operato justificent, nec docent fidem requiri in usu sacramentorum, quæ credat remitti peccata."—Art. xiii.

In the apology for the Confession, and in his Catechism, Melancthon says:—

"Damnatus totum populum Scholasticorum doctorum, qui docent, quod sacramenta non ponenti obicem, conferant gratiam ex opere operato, sine bono motu utentis.—Nos docemus, quod in usu sacramentorum, fides debeat accedere, quæ credat illis promissionibus, et accipiat res promissas, quæ ibi in sacramento offeruntur. Et est ratio plana et firmissima. Promissio est inutilis nisi fide accipiatur. At sacramenta sunt signa promissionum."—Apologia Confessionis. De numero et usu Sacramentorum. Witenbergæ, 1635, p. 123.

"Sciant igitur pii, utendum esse integro Sacramento, sicut Christus instituit: et cum sumunt corpus et sanguinem Domini, Christum adesse et efficacem esse."—Catechesis, De Cœna Domini, Opp. Wittebergæ, 1580, Tom. i. p. 27.

Gerhard in the following passage, for a reference to which I am indebted to Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, c. II. i. Oxford,

τεθεωμένον, the Lord's Deified body. Now saith he, a body united to Divinity is not one nature; there is one nature of the body and another nature of the Divinity which is united to it; so that both these together are not one nature but two.—He illustrates it by adulterated gold when it is purified, the fire that is in it worketh quite another effect than the gold, to which it is united, could of itself produce. So he elsewhere explains it by red-hot iron, and again more fully by a red-hot sword which cuts as it is a sword, and at the same time burns by force of the fire united to it. (1. III. c. xvii. xix.)—Covel's Account of the present Greek Church, xxxiii. Camb. 1722.

iron and fire. Why much more may not the glorious body of Christ be thus in every part of the substance of the bread?"

"The body of Christ is in such manner in the Sacrament, the bread [still] remaining, as fire in iron, the substance of the iron remaining; and [as] God in man, the humanity remaining; the substances in both cases being so mingled, that its own operation and proper nature should remain to each, and yet they should constitute some one thing."

"Of the supper of the Lord, they teach that the body and blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to those who eat in the Lord's Supper.

"They condemn those who teach, that the sacraments justify ex opere operato, and who do not teach that in the use of the sacraments faith is required, to believe that sins are forgiven."

"We condemn the whole nation of the School doctors, who teach that the sacraments confer grace ex opere operato without any good motion of the user, upon him who does not place a bar to it. We teach that in the use of the sacraments, faith ought to be present, to believe those promises, and receive the things promised, which are offered there in the Sacrament. And there is a plain and very strong reason. A promise is useless unless it be received with faith. But the Sacraments are signs of the promises."

"Let the pious therefore know, that the whole Sacrament is to be used as Christ instituted it; and when they take the body and blood of the Lord, that Christ is present and is efficacious."

1847-1848, vol. i. p. 312, gives a more elaborate statement of the doctrine:—

“Credimus in Eucharistiæ sacramento veram, realem, et substantialem corporis et sanguinis Christi præsentiam, exhibitionem, manducationem, et bibitionem. Quæ presentia non est essentialis conversio panis in corpus, et vini in sanguinem Christi, quam transubstantiationem vocant: neque est corporis ad panem, ac sanguinis ad vinum extra usum Cœnæ, localis aut durabilis affixio; neque est panis et corporis Christi personalis unio, qualis est Divinæ et humanæ naturæ in Christo unio; neque est localis inclusio corporis in panem; neque est impanatio: neque incorporatio in panem; neque est consubstantiatio qua panis cum corpore Christi et vinum cum ipsius sanguine in unam massam physicam coalescat: neque est naturalis inexistencia; neque delitescencia corpusculi sub pane; neque quicquam hujusmodi carnale, aut physicum: sed est præsentia et unio sacramentalis, quæ ita comparata est, ut juxta ipsius Salvatoris nostri veracis, sapientis et omnipotentis institutionem, pani benedicto tanquam medio divinitus ordinato corpus, et vino benedicto tanquam medio itidem divinitus ordinato sanguis Christi, modo nobis incomprehensibili, uniatur; ut cum illo pane corpus Christi una manducatione sacramentali et cum illo vino sanguinem Christi una bibitione sacramentali in sublimi mysterio sumamus, manducemus, et bibamus. Breviter, non ἀπουσίαν absentiam, non ἐπουσίαν inexistenciam, non συνουσίαν consubstantiationem, non μετουσίαν transubstantiationem, sed παρουσίαν corporis et sanguinis Christi in Cœna statuimus.”—Gerhard. Loc. Theolog. de Sacr. Cœna, c. x. § 69. Opp. Francof. 1647. Vol. v. pp. 55, 56.

This looks, indeed, like a denial of consubstantiation; and yet it is not. It is a denial only of “a consubstantiation by which the bread would coalesce with the body of Christ into one physical mass, and the wine with his blood:” but not a denial of “a true, real, and substantial presence of the Body and Blood,” in, with, or under, the bread and wine. Immediately before this passage, the author says:—

“Quam vere in Sacra Cœna præsens est res terrena, panis et vinum; tam vere etiam præsens est res cœlestis, corpus et sanguis Christi; proinde credimus, docemus, et confitemur in Eucharistiæ Sacramento,” &c.

“We believe that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist there is a true, real, and substantial presence, exhibition, eating, and drinking of the body and blood of Christ. Which presence is not an essential conversion of the bread into the body, and of the wine into the blood of Christ, which they call transubstantiation: nor is it a local or durable adjunction of the body to the bread, and of the blood to the wine, without the use of the Supper: nor is it a personal union of the bread and the body of Christ, such as is the union of the Divine and the human nature in Christ: nor is it a local inclusion of the body into the bread; nor is it impanation; nor an incorporation into the bread; nor is it a consubstantiation by which the bread coalesces with the body of Christ, and the wine with his blood, into one physical mass: nor is it a natural existence, nor hiding, of a little body under the bread: nor any such carnal or physical thing: but it is a sacramental presence and union, which is so appointed, that according to the institution of our true, wise, and omnipotent Saviour himself, the body is united to the consecrated bread as to a medium divinely ordained, and the blood of Christ to the consecrated wine as to a medium in like manner divinely ordained, in a manner incomprehensible to us; so that with that bread by one sacramental eating, the body of Christ, and with that wine by one sacramental drinking, the blood of Christ, we take, eat, and drink, in a sublime mystery. Briefly, we determine, not absence, not inexistence, not consubstantiation, not transubstantiation, but a presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper.”

“As truly as there is present an earthly thing, bread and wine: so truly also is there present a heavenly thing, the body and blood of Christ: therefore we believe, teach, and confess that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist,” &c.

In another part of the same treatise, he speaks of the bread

and wine, and the Body and the Blood, as “*duæ res modo quodam unitæ*,” two things in a certain manner united. And he also says (§ 96) that the words of the institution: “This is my body,” are most fitly resolved by: “In, with, or under, this bread, I exhibit my body.” But the distinction between the consubstantiation which he rejected, and that which he in truth held in common with the Lutheran body, is exhibited with sufficient clearness in this passage:—

“Non enim statim est consubstantiatio, quando duæ substantiæ sibi sunt præsentēs; alias, quia divina et humana Christi natura per unionem personalem sibi sunt præsentēs in persona Christi foret ea, quam adversarii appellant consubstantiatio: sed quando duæ substantiæ physico et naturali modo coexistunt. At res cælestes et res terrena in S. Cœna physice et naturaliter sibi non sunt præsentēs.”—Ibid. c. xi. 98, p. 81.

“For there is not forthwith consubstantiation, when two substances are present to themselves; otherwise because the divine and human nature of Christ are by personal union present to themselves in the person of Christ, there would be that, which our adversaries call consubstantiation: but when two substances co-exist in a physical and natural mode. Whereas things heavenly and an earthly thing are not physically and naturally present to themselves in the Holy Supper.”

It would appear, therefore, that it was *ὁμοουσία* rather than *συνουσία*, which Gerhard intended to deny: for he maintained the literal presence of the heavenly substance, in, with, or under, the earthly; asserting only that they were not changed into one compound physical mass, but had a distinct co-existence.* And it was in the strict etymological meaning that he used *παρουσία*.

Suicer (sub voce *συνουσιαστικῆς*) defining *συνουσία* to be the mixture of two substances into one mass, says therefore, that the Lutherans are wrongly called *συνουσιασταί*, consubstantiators; and that they are rather to be called *δισυνουσιασταί*, bisubstantiators. I apprehend, however, that *συνουσία* may be taken as signifying the presence of one substance with another; without any notion of their being compounded into one mass.

The term consubstantiation, seems to have been first applied to the doctrine of the Eucharist, by Johannes de Parisiis, A.D. 1290: (Cave's Hist. Litt. II. 333.) Mosheim, Hist. Eccl. sæc. XIII. p. II. c. iii. 14. Occam (Cave II. 28. A.) used coexistence for it. See Hospinian. Hist. Sacramentar. II. 6.

As to participation, neither Romanists nor Lutherans allow that bad men are partakers of the benefits.

The decree of the Council of Trent, “De usu admirabilis hujus Sacramenti,” says:—

* As Luther says that “the substances,” though they constitute “some one thing,” are only “so mingled, that its own operation and proper nature” remains “to each.”

“Quoad usum autem recte, et sapienter Patres nostri tres rationes hoc sanctum Sacramentum accipiendi distinxerunt. Quosdam enim docuerunt sacramentaliter duntaxat id sumere; ut peccatores: alios tantum spiritaliter; illos nimirum, qui voto propositum illum panem cœlestem edentes, fide viva, quæ per dilectionem operatur, fructum ejus, et utilitatem sentiunt: tertios porro sacramentaliter simul et spiritaliter. Hi autem sunt, qui ita se prius probant, et instruunt, ut vestem nuptialem induti ad divinam hanc mensam accedant.”—Sess. 13, cap. 8.

“But with regard to the use, our Fathers have rightly and wisely distinguished three ways of receiving this holy Sacrament. For they have taught that some take it only sacramentally; as sinners: others only spiritually; those namely, who in desire eat that heavenly bread set forth, with a living faith, which worketh by love, perceive its fruit and utility; but the third [sort] at the same time sacramentally and spiritually. Now these are they, who so first prove and prepare themselves, that having put on the wedding garment they may come to this divine table.”

And the eleventh Canon of the same Session enacts:—

“Si quis dixerit, solam fidem esse sufficientem præparationem ad sumendum sanctissimæ Eucharistiæ sacramentum; anathema sit. Et ne tantum Sacramentum indigne, atque ideo in mortem, et condemnationem sumatur; statuit, atque declarat ipsa Sancta Synodus, illis, quos conscientia peccati mortalis gravat, quantumcumque etiam se contritos existiment, habita copia confessoris necessario præmittendam esse confessionem sacramentalem.”

“If any one shall say, that faith alone is a sufficient preparation for receiving the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist; let him be anathema. And lest so great a Sacrament be taken unworthily, and therefore unto death and condemnation; the holy synod itself determines and declares, that they, whom the conscience of mortal sin oppresses, even how much soever they may think themselves contrite, must necessarily, when they have the opportunity of a confessor, use sacramental confession before-hand.”

On the part of the Lutherans, Mosheim, and Gerhard, indeed, say:—

“Nos—omnes homines, sive probi sint, sive improbi, corporis et Sanguinis Domini vere compotes fieri in sacra cœna statuimus.”—Mosheim. ad Cudworth. Opp. Tom. II. p. 869. Lugd. Bat. 1773, De Vera Notione Cœnæ, c. IV. ii. a.

“We—determine that all men, whether they be good or bad, are made truly partakers of the body and blood of the Lord in the holy Supper.”

“Nostra sententia est indignos in sacra Cœna non solum panem et vinum, sed etiam mediante pane Christi corpus, et mediante vino Christi sanguinem sacramentaliter accipere, manducare, ac bibere.”—Gerhard. De Sacra. Cœna, c. xxii. 231, p. 192.

“Our opinion is that in the holy Supper, the unworthy [receive] not only bread and wine, but also by means of the bread sacramentally receive and eat the body of Christ, and by means of the wine, sacramentally receive and drink the blood of Christ.”

But the Augsburg Confession condemns the doctrine of the *opus operatum* (see p. 564); and requires faith in the use of the Sacrament. And the Apology for the Confession says:—

“In sacramento duo sunt, signum et Verbum: verbum in novo Testamento per promissionem gratiæ addita signo.—Ceremonia est quasi pictura verbi seu sigillum, ut Paulus vocat, ostendens promissionem. Ergo sicut promissio inutilis est, nisi fide accipiatur, ita inutilis est ceremonia, nisi fides accedat.”—Apol. Conf. Witenbergæ 1535, p. 164, De Usu Sacramenti.

“In a sacrament are two things, the sign and the word: the word in the New Testament is the promise of grace added to the sign.—The ceremony is as it were a picture or seal, as Paul calls it, of the word, shewing the promise. Therefore as the promise is useless, unless it be received by faith, so the ceremony is useless, unless faith be present.”

But when we read the words of our Lord Jesus Christ

himself: "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me:" (John vi. 54-57)—we cannot fail to see, how inconsistent and unscriptural is the belief, that anyone can eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, without partaking of the grace and benefits of his death.

St. Augustine will supply a fitting comment.

"Hujus rei Sacramentum, id est, unitatis corporis et sanguinis Christi alicubi quotidie, alicubi certis intervallis dierum in dominica mensa preparatur, et de mensa dominica sumitur, quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium. Res vero ipsa, ejus Sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicumque ejus particeps fuerit.—Qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, proculdubio nec manducat spiritualiter carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi; sed magis tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit."—August. in Johan. vi. 54, 56. Tr. in Ev. Joann. xxvi. 15, 18.—Tom. III. 1886 C. 1987 B.

"The Sacrament of this thing, that is, of the unity of the body and blood of Christ, is in some places daily, in some at certain intervals of days, prepared on the Lord's table, and from the Lord's table is taken by some to life, by some to destruction. But the thing itself, of which it is the Sacrament, [is received] by every man to life, by none to destruction, whoever shall be partaker of it.—He who abides not in Christ, and in whom Christ abides not, without doubt eats not spiritually of his flesh, nor drinks his blood, although carnally and visibly he may press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; but rather to his own condemnation, he eats and drinks the sacrament of so great a thing."

Yet though there is no very material difference in the doctrines of transubstantiation and consubstantiation, yet there is a great difference in the *manner*, in which these doctrines are maintained. For the Lutherans believe "that Christ's body is present only when" the Sacrament "is received." They deny that the grace of the sacrament is conferred *ex opere operato*; and assert that it is not received without a special faith. "They adore not the holy sacrament: They found no propitiatory sacrifice upon it: They say no masses for the sins and satisfactions, for the wants and necessities of the dead and the living: They deny not the Cup to the people: their error, in one word, is only a matter of simple belief;—nor do they [anathematise] us for not receiving it."—Tracts against Popery, Tit. ix. p. 42.

Lutherans imagine that our Lord's body is possessed of the power of ubiquity from its union with Deity. And in reference to this notion, I take leave to subjoin a few places of St. Augustine.

“Loquebatur enim (S. Johan. xii. 8) de præsentia corporis sui. Nam secundum majestatem suam, secundum providentiam, secundum ineffabilem et invisibilem gratiam impletur quod ab eo dictum est, *Ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem sæculi*. Secundum carnem vero quam verbum assumpsit, secundum id quod de virgine natus est, secundum id quod a Judæis comprehensus est, quod ligno confixus, quod de cruce depositus, quod linteis involutus, quod in sepulchro conditus, quod in resurrectione manifestatus, *non semper habebitis vobiscum*. Quare? Quoniam conversatus est secundum corporis præsentiam quadraginta diebus cum discipulis suis, et eis deducentibus videndo, non sequendo, ascendit in celum, et non est hic: ibi est enim, *sedet ad dexteram Patris*. Et hic est: non enim recessit præsentia majestatis. Aliter: secundum præsentiam majestatis semper habemus Christum: secundum præsentiam carnis recte dictum est discipulis, *Me autem non semper habebitis*. Habuit enim illum ecclesia secundum præsentiam carnis paucis diebus: modo fide tenet, oculis non videt.”—August. in Evangel. Johan. Tract. L. 13.

“Et abiit, et hic est; et rediit, et nos non deserit. Corpus enim suum intulit celo; majestatem non abstulit mundo.”—In Johan L. 4.

“Sursum est Dominus, sed etiam hic est veritas Dominus. Corpus enim Domini, in quo resurrexit, uno loco esse potest: veritas ejus ubique diffusa est.”—In Evangel. Johan. Tract. XXX. 1.

“Christus secundum præsentiam—corporalem, simul et in sole, et in luna, et in cruce esse non posset.”—Contra Faust. Lib. XX. xi.

True Catholic doctrine requires us to believe that each nature retains its distinct properties.

“The sequel of [the] conjunction of natures in the person of Christ,” (says Hooker,) “is no abolishment of natural properties appertaining to either substance, no transition or transmigration thereof out of one substance into another: finally, no such mutual infusion, as really causeth the same natural operations or properties to be made common unto both substances; but whatsoever is natural to Deity, the same remaineth in Christ uncommunicated unto his manhood, and whatsoever natural to manhood, his Deity thereof is incapable.—We may not, therefore, imagine, that the properties of the weaker nature have vanished with the presence of the more glorious, and have been therein swallowed up as in a gulf.—Shall we say, that in heaven his glorious body, by virtue of the same cause,

“For Christ spake of the presence of his body. For in regard to his majesty, in regard to his providence, in regard to his ineffable and invisible grace, that which was said by Him is fulfilled: Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. But in regard to the flesh which the Word took, in regard to that He was born of the Virgin, in regard to that He was taken of the Jews, was fastened to the wood, was taken down from the cross, was wrapped in linen clothes, was laid in the sepulchre, was manifested in the resurrection,—me ye have not always. Wherefore? Because in regard to the presence of his body, He conversed with his disciples forty days, and as they accompanied Him by seeing, not by following Him, He went up into heaven, and is not here; for He is there, He sitteth at the right hand of the Father. Yet He is here: for the presence of his majesty did not depart. In other words: in regard to the presence of his majesty we have Christ always; in regard to the presence of his flesh, it was rightly said to the disciples, me ye have not always. For in regard to the presence of his flesh, the Church had Him [but] a few days: now she holds Him by faith, she does not see Him with eyes.”

“He is both gone away, and is here. He has both returned [to heaven] and does not desert us. For He took his body into heaven: and did not take away his majesty from the world.”

“The Lord is above, but the Lord the Truth is also here. For the body of the Lord, in which He rose can be [but] in one place: his truth is diffused everywhere.”

“Christ, according to his bodily presence, could not be at the same time both in the sun, and in the moon, and on the cross.”

hath now power to present itself in all places, and to be everywhere at once present? We nothing doubt, but God hath, many ways above the reach of our capacities, exalted that body which it hath pleased Him to make his own, that body wherewith He hath saved the world, that body which hath been and is the root of eternal life; the instrument wherewith Deity worketh, the sacrifice which taketh away sin, the price which hath ransomed souls from death, the leader of the whole army of bodies that shall rise again. For though it had a beginning from us, yet God hath given it vital efficacy, heaven hath endowed it with celestial power, that virtue it hath from above, in regard whereof all the angels of heaven adore it. Notwithstanding, *a body it still continueth, a body consubstantial with our body, a body of the same both nature and measure which it had on earth.*—

“Which Deity being common unto Him with none but only the Father and Holy Ghost, it followeth, that nothing of Christ which is limited, that nothing created, that neither the soul nor the body of Christ, and consequently, not Christ as man, or Christ according to his human nature, can possibly be everywhere present.—The substance of the body of Christ hath no presence, neither can have, but only local. It was not therefore everywhere seen, nor did everywhere suffer death, everywhere it could not be entombed, it is not everywhere now, being exalted into heaven. *There is no proof in the world strong enough to enforce that Christ had a true body, but by the true and natural properties of his body.*—His human substance in itself is naturally absent from the earth, his soul and body not on the earth, but in heaven only: yet because this substance is inseparably joined to that personal Word, which by his very Divine essence is present with all things; the nature which cannot have in itself universal presence, hath it *after a sort*, by being *no where severed* from that which is everywhere present.—

“The *person of Christ is whole*, perfect God and perfect man, wheresoever; although the parts of his manhood, being finite, and his Deity infinite, we cannot say that the *whole of Christ* is simply everywhere, as we may say that his Deity is, and that his person is by force of Deity. For, *somewhat of the person of Christ* is not everywhere in that sort; namely, his manhood, the *only conjunction* whereof with Deity is extended as far as Deity, the *actual position* restrained and tied to a certain place; yet presence *by way of conjunction* is in some sort presence.—His body being a part of that nature, which nature is presently joined unto Deity; wheresoever Deity is, it followeth, that his bodily substance hath everywhere a presence of true conjunction with Deity. And forasmuch as it is, by virtue of that conjunction, made the body of the Son of God, by whom also it was made a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, this giveth it a *presence of force and efficacy* throughout all generations of men.”—Ecll. Polity, v. 53, 55.

I hope these extracts will induce the reader to study carefully the whole of the sections from which they are taken.

APPENDIX V.

Referred to in p. 93. The Roman Canon of the Mass, and conversion of Substances.

The words of consecration, in the Canon of the Mass, are:—

“Hoc est corpus meum.”
 “Hic est calix sanguinis mei novi
 et æterni testamenti: mysterium fidei:
 qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in
 remissionem peccatorum.”

“*This is my body.*”
 “*This is the cup of my blood of the
 new and eternal testament: the mystery
 of faith: which shall be shed for you,
 and for many, to the remission of sins.*”

Where it is to be observed, that in the consecration of the bread, the words of our Lord are curtailed: in order, no doubt, to give the more countenance to transubstantiation; and that not even a syllable may intervene between the corporal presence, and the adoration of it by the priest.

In the consecration of the cup, the words are changed in three ways: by substitution, by addition, and by omission. First, instead of “This cup is the new testament in my blood,” as St. Luke and St. Paul relate them; or, “This is my blood of the new testament,” as St. Matthew and St. Mark relate them; the Roman form has: “This is the cup of my blood of the new and eternal testament:” and instead of “which is shed;” the interpretation, “which shall be shed,” is substituted. Next, the “Canon” has: “the new and eternal testament;” and gives to the chalice or the blood, the addition of “the mystery of faith.” And lastly, the injunctions: “Drink ye all of this,” and “this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me,” are altogether left out.

These changes are made in plain subservience to the doctrine of transubstantiation, and to the practice of communion in one kind.

I do not overlook the circumstances, that St. Matthew and St. Mark have only: “This is my body,” at the giving of the bread; and that no one of the sacred writers has a full account of the words which our Lord used when He gave the cup. But the several accounts are not the less true: and while some things might be omitted by one, and some by another, as the purposes of his narrative might allow; it is undeniable that the whole form of words, in which this Sacrament was instituted, is to be obtained from the joint contribution of each, and the harmony of all. And if the consecration of the elements is effected, as the Romanists say it is, by the repetition of our

Lord's words, why do they take part only, and not all? And how can they show that the words which they use are sufficient for the purpose, without the words which they reject?

It is an unfailing test of the spirit of heresy, to take part only of the truth of Scripture; whereas the sincere Catholic faith embraces the whole. Being inspired by that gracious Spirit, who was promised to "guide us into all the truth," it is possessed with "the love of the truth;" and "holding the Head," even Him who is the Truth, it suffers not "one of the least commandments" to be slighted, or "one jot or one tittle" to pass from it.

On the consecration of the elements, see Bingham's *Christ. Antiq.* XV. iii. 12, p. 94; and Archd. Yardley, in Bp. Mant's *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer*, on "the prayer of consecration."

Bellarmino lays down three kinds of conversion, by which a transubstantiation, or change of one substance into another, may be supposed to be wrought. He says:—

"Notandum est, ad veram conversionem non requiri, ut id, in quod aliquid convertitur de novo perducatur, sed satis esse si unum alteri succedat: sive id tunc producat, sive aliunde adducatur, sive alio modo id fiat. Tribus enim modis fieri potest conversio. Nam si terminus ad quem non existat, vi conversionis, necessario producat, et inde vocatur a quibusdam ea conversio productiva; qualis fuit conversio aquæ in vinum in Cana Galileæ, et aliæ permultæ. Si vero terminus ad quem existat, sed non in eo loco, ubi est terminus a quo, tunc vi conversionis adducatur ad eum locum, et inde vocatur ea conversio adductiva: talis fere est conversio cibi in hominem per nutritionem; quod attinet ad introductionem animæ. Quamvis enim caro, quæ fit ex cibo, vere producat; tamen anima non producat, sed tantum per nutritionem fit ut incipiat esse in ea materia, ubi antea erat forma cibi. Si denique terminus ad quem existat, et in ipso loco eodem, ubi est terminus a quo, ut verbi gratia, si duo corpora æqualia se penetrent, et unum divina virtute totaliter vertatur in aliud, tunc vi conversionis non producat, neque adducatur terminus ad quem, sed solum conservabitur, et inde dicitur ea conversio conservativa: nam cum non possint naturaliter duo corpora simul esse, si Deus

"It is to be noted, that it is not required for true conversion, that the thing into which any thing is converted should be brought *de novo*; but that it is enough if one thing succeed another; whether it be then produced, or be adduced from something else, or be in any other mode. For conversion may be made in three modes. If the *terminus ad quem* do not exist, it will necessarily be produced by the force of conversion, and thence this conversion is by some called productive, as was the conversion of water into wine in Cana of Galilee, and many other conversions. But if the *terminus ad quem* be in existence, but not in that place, where the *terminus a quo* is, then, by force of conversion, it will be adduced to that place, and hence this conversion is called adductive: such commonly is the conversion of food into man by nutrition; which pertains to the introduction of the soul. For although flesh, which is mad of food, be truly produced; yet the soul is not produced, but only by nutrition it comes that it should begin to be in that matter, where before was the form of food. If, lastly, the *terminus ad quem* exist, and in that same place, where the *terminus a quo* is, as for example, if two equal bodies penetrate themselves, and one by divine power be totally changed into another, then by

unum interimeret, ut alterum naturaliter ibi servaret, diceretur unum in alterum converti, ex eo quod unum desineret esse, ut alterum permaneret in esse.

“Ex his colligimus conversionem panis in corpus Domini non esse productivam, nec conservativam, sed adductivam. Nam corpus Domini præexistit ante conversionem, sed non sub speciebus panis: conversio igitur non facit, ut corpus Christi simpliciter esse incipiat, sed ut incipiat esse sub speciebus panis. Porro adductivam vocamus istam conversionem, non quia corpus Christi per hanc adductionem deseret suum locum in cælo, vel quia per motum localem huc de cælo adducetur, sed solum quia per eam fit, ut corpus Christi, quod antea solum erat in cælo, jam etiam sit sub speciebus panis, et non solum sub illis sit per simplicem præsentiam, sive coexistentiam, sed etiam per unionem quandam, qualis erat inter substantiam panis, et accidentia panis, excepta tamen inhærentia.”

The Cardinal also makes this distinction:—

“Non enim per conversionem istam fit præsentia (relationes enim non fiunt, sed consequuntur), sed fit, ut corpus Christi succedat pani: proinde substantia in substantiam transit, et substantia substantiæ succedit; non enim panis convertitur in præsentiam corporis Domini, sed in ipsum corpus Domini.”

And again he says:—

“Subjectum in quo recipitur actio divina hujus conversionis, partim esse panem, partim corpus Christi. Nam illa actio, ut conversio, in pane recipitur; panis enim est qui convertitur, proinde panis solus mutatur substantialiter. At illa eadem actio, ut adductiva corporis Christi, in ipso Christi corpore recipitur: illud enim est quod adducitur, id est, acquirit esse sub speciebus panis, quod antea non habebat.

“Quod autem S. Thomas et alii dicunt, corpus Christi incipere esse in Sacramento, non per mutationem sui, sed

force of the conversion, the *terminus ad quem* will not be produced, nor adduced, but shall only be conserved, and hence this conversion is called conservative: for when two bodies cannot naturally be [in the same place] together, if God should destroy one of them, to preserve the other naturally there, one would be said to be converted into the other, for the reason that one had ceased to be, that the other might remain in being.

“From these we conclude that the conversion of the bread into the body of the Lord is not productive, nor conservative, but adductive. For the body of the Lord pre-exists before the conversion, but not under the species of bread: the conversion therefore does not cause that the body of Christ should simply begin to be, but that it should begin to be under the species of bread. Moreover we call that conversion adductive, not because the body of Christ by this adduction leaves its place in heaven, or because it be brought hither from heaven by local motion, but only because by that conversion it is, that the body of Christ, which before was only in heaven, is now also under the species of bread, and not only is under it by a simple presence, or co-existence, but also by a certain union, such as was between the substance of the bread, and the accidents of the bread, yet with the exception of inherence.”

“For the presence does not take place by that conversion (for relations are not made but follow), but it takes place, that the body of Christ should succeed to the bread: therefore substance passes into substance, and substance succeeds substance: for the bread is not converted into the presence of the Lord's body, but into the Lord's body itself.”

“That the subject in which the divine action of this conversion is received, is partly the bread, and partly the body of Christ. Because that action, as conversion, is received in the bread; for it is bread which is converted, therefore the bread alone is changed substantially. But that same action, as adductive of the body of Christ, is received in the body of Christ itself: for it is that which is adduced, that is, acquires the being under the species of bread, which it had not before.

“But that which St. Thomas, and others say, that the body of Christ begins to be in the Sacrament, not by mutation

per mutationem panis in ipsum, verum est, sed intelligi debet de mutatione deperditiva; non autem de omni mutatione. Nam vere corpus Christi quod est in cælo, non mutat, nec substantiam, nec ulla accidentia, nec ipsum etiam locum: tamen acquirit aliquid quod non habebat, nimirum esse Sacramentale, quod sine aliqua mutatione intelligi nequit.

“Cum per conversionem panis, idem corpus in sacra hostia ponitur, actio illa in corpore Domini recipitur, non quidem ut conversio, sed ut adductio est. Denique conversio, quatenus panem destruit, non tam est actio quam negatio actionis: Deus enim destruit panem, dum desinit eum conservare. At per negationem nihil positive, et realiter fieri potest; ergo positio corporis Domini sub illis speciebus, quæ est quid positivum, non fit ab illa conversione, ut ea est in pane, sed ut est, et recipitur in corpore Christi.

“Transubstantiatio est una actio, quia est quedam voluntas, seu volitio Dei, qua ipse vult non conservare panem, ut in ejus locum ponatur corpus Domini.”—De Eucharistia, III. xvii. 556, 557.

Transubstantiation, then, according to Bellarmine, is a single action of God, in which by negation of action He ceases to conserve the bread, and so destroys it; and, in a certain positivity of action, puts the body of Christ in its place by adductive conversion. The bread suffers deperditive mutation: but the body of the Lord, without change of substance, of any accidents, or even of place, is put under the species of the bread; substance passing into substance, and substance succeeding substance. The conversion is of the bread, by its destruction; and yet there is a mutation of it into the Lord's body, which succeeds into its place. His body is not changed, yet it receives adductive conversion, not as it is conversion, but as it is adduction. In short, Transubstantiation is not transubstantiation: substance is not converted into substance; but substance succeeds and takes the place of substance. It is a very puzzle to the divines of Rome, who tax their ingenuity in explanations and distinctions, and leave the subject as inexplicable and incredible as they find it.

of itself, but by mutation of the bread into it, is true, but ought to be understood of deperditive mutation: but not of every mutation. For certainly the body of Christ, which is in heaven, does not change, either its substance, or any accidents, or even its very place: yet it acquires something which it had not, that is, to be Sacramental, which cannot be understood without some mutation.

“When, by conversion of the bread, the same body is placed in the sacred host, that action is received in the Lord's body, not indeed as it is conversion, but as it is adduction.—Lastly, conversion, so far as it destroys the bread, is not so much action, as negation of action; for God destroys the bread, while He ceases to conserve it. But by negation, nothing can be done positively and really; therefore the placing of the Lord's body under those species, which is something positive, does not take place by that conversion, as it is in the bread, but as it is, and is received in the body of Christ.

“Transubstantiation is a single action, because it is a certain will or volition of God, by which He wills not to conserve the bread, in order that the body of the Lord may be put in its place.”

APPENDIX W.

Referred to in p. 104. We eat—a dead body.

“Our Saviour told His disciples to do what He had just done, and as He did it. First to take the loaf, to give thanks over it, then to break it, and to divide it among themselves: all this in remembrance of Him as He was then, and not as He would be afterwards in heaven.

“*Ἀνάμνησις*, if it mean anything here, clearly implies that the disciples should carry their minds back to the hour at which He instituted the Sacrament, and think of Him as He was then, His heart wrung with grief, His spirit troubled above measure, His body weighed down under the burden of our sins, which He was then bearing, and Himself already, as it were, dying, and soon dead on the cross for their sakes.”

“Our Saviour’s words are rendered by St. Luke and St. Paul *Εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, while *εἰς τὴν μου ἀνάμνησιν*, and, with greater emphasis, *εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου*, would have been quite as good Greek, though not so full of meaning.

“In Greek, however, the possessive pronouns are never used like this, in an objective form except when meant to convey a peculiar force of expression:—as—in *τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, the remembrance of Me, your Friend, your Saviour, suffering, afflicted, sorrowful unto death, betrayed, and brought to death for your sakes. It is somewhat singular that those who find a great deal more in *ἀνάμνησις* than it ever meant in Greek, overlook this, I may say, earnest and touching expression in our Saviour’s words.”—Malan on the Holy Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, pp. 92, 97, 98.

APPENDIX X.

Referred to in p. 269. The bread is, and is not, the body of Christ: the wine is, and is not, his blood.

The following passages from Archdeacon Freeman may be taken in connection with the statement in the text. He says:—

“It is to be observed, that in almost all cases in which a mysterious truth is propounded by Almighty God for our acceptance, it is in reality to a two-fold or compound, and not to a single or simple article of belief, that our assent is required. The peculiar task which our faculty of belief is set in such cases is no other than this: to hold in conjunction, simply and without reserve, some *two* divinely affirmed matters or positions, either of which we should probably make no difficulty of accepting by itself, but whose *compatibility*, or *possible co-existence*, we are unable to perceive. So it is with the great cardinal truth of the Holy Trinity: of the Unity, that is, of the Godhead, and of the existence, nevertheless, in that

Godhead, of Three Persons. Both truths being as clearly declared in Scripture, as they were from the beginning unhesitatingly handed down by the Church ; it is not in reconciling them, or in proving their reconcilability,—a task beyond the reach of human faculties,—that right faith consists : but in simply believing them both, leaving to God the solution of the difficulty or mystery. So is it, again, with the union of the Two Natures in the One Person of Christ, with the co-existence of God's foreknowledge and our free will ; with that of divine inspiration and human writing ; and many like mysteries.

“ And for our confirmation and encouragement in holding fast to a Creed involving not a few such paradoxes as these, notwithstanding the cavils which it is obvious to make against it on that account, we are provided, in the natural scheme of things, with perfect or sufficient analogies. The union of the soul with the body ; the connection between life and thought ; between volition and mechanical action in the human frame ;— these and other facts of the same class, occupying the mysterious confines of matter and spirit, are perhaps as inexplicable by us as the class of truths just described ; as the doctrine of the Trinity, or of the hypostatic Union : since we can give no account whatever of the manner in which the co-existence has place, or how it can have place at all, in the one case any more than in the other. The only difference is that, in the case of the theological verities, the two great *terms* of the paradox or mystery in each case, as well as the paradox itself, are completely above our comprehension. Our incapacity to reconcile them, or conceive the mode of their co-existence, is in both cases absolute. And our position, as believing Christians, is, that we hold to one divinely-attested Creed on these mysterious points, notwithstanding our inability to reconcile the two terms of the mystery in each case : just as we accept, on the evidence of our senses, the fact of certain wonderful co-existences and combinations within and around us, albeit it defies our penetration to discern, or even conceive, the manner of them.

“ It is only necessary to observe further, concerning the apprehension of any mystery, that, as regards the way in which the two terms or sides of it mutually affect each other, all we know, strictly speaking, is this :—that while neither term can be held to effect or diminish the degree in which the other is true, or, in other words, the *truth* of its existence, each does nevertheless of necessity affect, in a *negative* way, the manner in which the other exists or has place.

“ Now the Holy Eucharist, by the very terms and circumstances of its original Institution, is a mystery of the kind here spoken of. Our blessed Lord, in instituting it, declared, in the plainest and most unqualified manner, that “ the Bread,” which He had just “ taken ” and “ blessed,” (or “ given thanks ” over) and “ broken,” was “ His Body ” which was then being “ broken ” or “ given ” to God the Father in sacrifice : and that “ the Cup,” over which He had “ given thanks,” was “ His blood of (or under) the new Covenant,” which was then being “ shed.” As such, the disciples were bidden to “ take, eat, and drink ” them.

“How these things could be as He declared them to be, is inconceivable by us. The Ordinance is herein an absolute mystery. It involves a paradox or apparent contradiction; a seeming incompatibility of terms: in short, a mystery, whatever the exact nature or limits of that mystery may be held to be.”*

It seems, however, to have escaped the apprehension of the Archdeacon, though his words even suggest, that the co-existence of the two things in terms in the Eucharist, is not a co-existence in fact, or in actual being. One of the two terms denotes that which, in fact and actual being, is not. The body of Christ being given for us, and his blood being shed for us, are not: and therefore cannot be present, or co-exist with the bread and wine. The mystery is embarrassed by the supposition of their presence. The real mystery is not in the co-existence of the “worldly elements,” and the body and blood of Christ; but it is in the co-existence of these elements with that which is not; and this in such a manner as to be that thing in power and efficacy.

This would seem to be a still greater mystery than the co-existence of two things in real being. But it is the true mystery of the Eucharist. These two things or “positions” are “divinely affirmed;” the existence of the bread and wine, and that they are the body and blood of Christ: but not his body and blood anyhow, or as they now are, but his body given, and his blood shed. And although his body given, and his blood shed now are not in fact; yet in spiritual power they are, even giving life eternal.

The mystery is in the “compatibility” of that which is and that which is not.

APPENDIX Y.

Referred to in p. 296. On the steeped Eucharist.

At the Council of Braga, in Galicia, the following decree was made: †—

“Audivimus etiam quosdam schismatica ambitione detentos, contra divinos ordines, et apostolicas institutiones, lac pro vino in divinis sacrificiis dedicare; alios quoque intinctam eucharistiam populis, pro complemento communionis

“We have also heard that some, seized with schismatical ambition, contrary to divine orders, and apostolical institutions, dedicate milk instead of wine in the divine sacrifices; that others also reach forth to the people the eucharist steeped, for the

* Principles of Div. Service ii. Introd. pp. 14–18.

† See L’Arroque, p. 135.

porrigere. . . . Quod quam sit evangelicæ atque apostolicæ doctrinæ contrarium, et consuetudini ecclesiasticæ adversum, non difficile ab ipso fonte veritatis probatur, a quo ordinata ipsa Sacramentorum mysteria processerunt. Cum enim magister veritatis verum salutis nostræ sacrificium suis commendaret discipulis, non illis lac, sed panem tantum et calicem sub hoc sacramento cognoscimus commendata. Ait enim evangelica veritas: accepit Jesus panem et calicem, et benedicens, dedit discipulis suis. Cesset ergo lac in sacrificio offerri, quia manifestum et evidens exemplum evangelicæ veritatis illuxit, quod panem et vinum, aliud offerri non sinit. Illud vero quod pro complemento communionis intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec prolatum testimonium ex evangelio recipit, ubi apostolis corpus suum et sanguinem commendavit. Seorsim enim panis, et seorsim calicis commendatio memoratur. Nam intinctum panem aliis Christum præbuisse non legimus, excepto illo tantum discipulo, quem intincta buccella magistri proditorem ostenderet, non quod sacramenti hujus institutionem monstraret."

fulness of the communion. . . . Which how contrary it is to evangelical and apostolical doctrine, and opposed to ecclesiastical custom, is proved without difficulty from the very fountain of truth, from which the mysteries of the sacraments being ordained have themselves originated. For when the master of truth was commending the true sacrifice of our salvation to his disciples, we do not learn, that milk was commended to them in this sacrament, but only bread and the cup. For evangelical truth says: Jesus took bread and the cup, and blessing them, gave them to his disciples. Let milk therefore cease to be offered in the sacrifice, because a clear and evident example of evangelical truth has shone forth, which [apostles] bread and wine, and suffers not any thing else to be offered. But this thing, that they deliver to the people the Eucharist dipped for a perfect communion, does not receive any testimony brought from the gospel, when He commended his body and blood to the Apostles. For the delivery of the bread apart, and of the blood apart is related. For we do not read that Christ gave dipped bread to any others, that disciple only excepted, whom the sop should point out as the betrayer of his master, but not shew the institution of this sacrament."

In a Council at the end of the eleventh century, under Pope Urban II., another decree was made:—

"Ne quis communicet de altari, nisi corpus separatim et sanguinem similiter sumat, nisi per necessitatem, et per cautelam."—Baron. Annal. xl. p. 859. An. 1095, Col. Agrip. 1609.

"Let not any one communicate of the altar, unless he take the body separately, and the blood in like manner: except through necessity, and for caution."

APPENDIX Z.

Referred to in p. 297. The use of the steeped Eucharist leading to the disuse of the Cup.

It is curious to trace the steps by which this sacrilegious custom was established, long before even the decree of Constantine. While a belief in the necessity of both kinds continued, the practice of dipping the bread in the wine, for dying persons and young children, gradually prevailed. Then, as the tendency of opinion towards transubstantiation increased, and, in consequence, a superstitious dread of "spilling the blood," of any of it being taken up by the beard of the

communicant, and such like accidents, was created; we find that in many places, the Sacrament was permitted to be given to the people in the same way: the separate use of the cup being reserved to the clergy and principal laity: while, in other places, where this practice was displeasing, the communicants used quills or small tubes in partaking of the cup.* But when transubstantiation had been decreed, and the people were accordingly taught that in receiving one species, they received both the body and the blood; it became the practice to administer an unconsecrated cup in parish churches: the people being informed that it was no part of the Sacrament, but was merely to wash down the bread; and the consecrated cup being still permitted in the greater churches.

Transubstantiation was established in A.D. 1215: and in the year 1281, the following directions were given in the Constitutions of Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury:—

“Attendant insuper sacerdotes, quod cum communionem sacram porrigunt simplicibus paschali tempore vel alio, solícite eos instruant sub panis specie, simul eis dari corpus et sanguinem Domini, immo Christum integrum, vivum et verum, qui totus est sub specie sacramenti.† Doceant etiam eosdem illud, quod ipsis eisdem temporibus in calice propinatur, Sacramentum non esse, sed vinum purum eis hauriendum traditum, ut facilius sacrum Corpus glutiant, quod ceperunt. Solis enim celebrantibus sanguinem sub specie vini consecrati sumere in hujusmodi minoribus ecclesiis est concessum.”—Wilkins’ Concil. Magn. Brit. &c. Lond. 1737, vol. ii. p. 52. See also Hart’s Ecclesiastical Records, Camb. 1836, p. 183.

“Let priests moreover give heed, that when they administer the holy communion to the simple sort at Easter or any other time, they carefully instruct them, that under the species of bread, is given to them at the same time the body and blood of the Lord, yea whole Christ, living and true, who is entire under the species of the Sacrament. Let them also teach them, that that which is given them in the cup at those times, is not a sacrament, but pure wine handed to them to be drunk, that they may more easily swallow the sacred body which they have received. For to those only who celebrate” [the Sacrament,] i.e. the officiating priests, “is it permitted to take the blood under the species of consecrated wine in such smaller churches.”

It would seem that the disuse of the cup, as part of the communion, steadily increased; so that at length it became customary even in the greatest churches; and no rank of the laity, even from the highest to the lowest, was permitted to

* It appears that when the Pope celebrated High Mass in person, he partook of the cup through a “golden quill.” “Cum Pontifex Corpus Christi sumpserit, Episcopus Cardinalis porrigit ei calamum, quem Papa ponit in calice in manibus Diaconi existente, et sanguinis partem sugit.”—Sac. Cæremon. lib. II. cap. “De Missa Majori, Papa personaliter celebrante.”—In Tracts against Popery. Tit. vii. p. 234. “Si [vero] Papa in nocte nativitatis personaliter celebrat, non sugit sanguinem cum calamo, sed more communi.”—Ibid. See also Du Cange, in voce. Calamus, Canna argentea, and Pugillares.

† That is, the sacrament of the bread: for the Eucharist was used to be distinguished into two sacraments, one of the bread, and the other of the wine; as below, the priests are directed to teach the people, that the wine which was given them, was not a sacrament. See Bingham’s Christ. Antiq. XII. 1. iv.

enjoy the communion in both kinds. Of this we have the following remarkable proof, for which I am indebted to a note in the Bishop of St. Asaph's History of the Church of England, § 17. "In a MS. called Liber Regalis, giving an account of the coronation of Richard II., A.D. 1378, in the keeping of the Dean of Westminster," is this direction:—

"Descendentes rex et regina de solis suis et accedentes humiliter ad altare percipient corpus et sanguinem Domini de manu archiepiscopi vel episcopi missam celebrantis, corpore vero Domini a rege recepto, ministrabit ei vinum ad utendum post perceptionem sacramenti Abbas Westmonasteriensis, vel is qui vicem ejus pro tempore gerit."

"The king and queen descending from their thrones and humbly approaching to the altar, shall receive the Lord's body and blood from the hand of the Archbishop or Bishop who celebrates the mass, but when the king has received the body, the Abbot of Westminster, or he who for the time acts in his stead, shall minister to him the wine for his use after the receiving of the sacrament."

The reader will remember, that according to the doctrine of transubstantiation, the body and blood were both supposed to be received under one species, whether of the bread or of the wine. Having therefore received the body, the king was to believe that he had partaken of the blood also, and had enjoyed the whole Sacrament. And the cup which he received was mere wine, not consecrated, but given to him, according to the above constitution of Peckham, to be used after the receiving of the Sacrament. Had it been consecrated, it would have been called, not *wine*, but the blood.

APPENDIX A A.

Referred to in p. 297. The decree of the Council of Constance for disuse of the Cup.

To some of my readers it may be satisfactory to have the following extracts from this document:—

"Cum in nonnullis mundi partibus quidam temerarie asserere præsumant populum Christianum debere Sacramentum Eucharistiæ sub utraque panis et vini specie suscipere, et non solum sub specie panis, sed etiam sub specie vini, populum laicum passim communicent, etiam post cenam vel alias non jejuni, et communicandum esse pertinaciter asserant, contra laudabilem Ecclesiæ consuetudinem rationabiliter approbatam, quam tanquam sacrilegam damnabiliter reprobare conantur: hinc est, quod hoc

"Whereas in some parts of the world certain persons rashly presume to assert, that the Christian people ought to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both species of bread and wine, and not only under the species of bread, but also under the species of wine, communicate the lay people in different places, even after supper, or else not fasting, and pertinaciously assert that the communion ought to be [so] administered, contrary to the laudable custom of the Church reasonably approved, which they endeavour in a

præsens concilium sacrum generale Constantiense, in Spiritu sancto legitime congregatum, adversus hunc errorem salutis fidelium provideri satagens, matura plurium Doctorum tam divini quam humani juris deliberatione præhabita, declarat, decernit et definit, quod licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, et suis discipulis administraverit sub utraque specie panis et vini hoc venerabile sacramentum, TAMEN HOC NON OBSTANTE, sacerorum canonum autoritas laudabilis et approbata consuetudo Ecclesiæ servavit, et servat, quod hujusmodi sacramentum non debet confici post cœnam, neque a fidelibus recipi non jejunis, nisi in casu infirmitatis aut alterius necessitatis a jure vel Ecclesia concessio vel admissio. Et sicut hæc consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula et scandala est rationabiliter introducta, quod licet in primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi sacramentum recipitur a fidelibus sub utraque specie, postea a deficientibus sub utraque, et a laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur, cum firmissime credendum sit et nullatenus dubitandum, integrum Christi corpus et sanguinem tam sub specie panis, quam sub specie vini veraciter contineri. Unde cum hujusmodi consuetudo ab Ecclesia et sanctis Patribus rationabiliter introducta, et diutissime observata sit, habenda est pro lege, quam non licet reprobare, aut sine Ecclesiæ autoritate pro libito mutare. Quapropter dicere, quod hanc consuetudinem aut legem observare, sit sacrilegum aut illicitum, censi debet erroneum; et pertinaciter asserentes oppositum præmissorum, tanquam hæretici arcendi sunt et graviter puniendi.

“Item ipsa sancta synodus decernit et declarat super ista materia, reverentissimis in Christo patribus et dominis patriarchis, primatibus, archiepiscopis, episcopis, et eorum in spiritualibus vicariis ubilibet constitutis, processus esse dirigendos, in quibus eis committatur et mandetur autoritate hujus sacri Concilii sub pena excommunicationis, ut effectualiter puniant eos contra hoc decretum excedentes, qui communicando populum sub utraque specie panis et vini exhortati fuerint, et sic faciendum esse docuerint.”—Concil. Gen. Colon. Agrip. 1567, vol. iii. pp. 821, 822.

damnable manner to reprobate as sacrilegious: hence it is, that this present sacred Council General of Constance, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit, taking all pains to provide for the salvation of the faithful against this error, a mature deliberation of divers Doctors, as well of divine as of human law, being first had, declares, decrees, and determines, that although Christ after supper instituted, and administered to his disciples, under both species of bread and wine, this venerable sacrament, YET THIS NOTWITHSTANDING, the laudable authority of the sacred Canons, and the approved custom of the Church, has maintained, and does maintain, that such a sacrament ought not to be performed after supper, nor received by the faithful, not fasting, unless in the case of infirmity or of some other necessity allowed or admitted by law or by the Church. And as in order to avoid some dangers and scandals, this custom was reasonably introduced, that although in the primitive Church a sacrament of this kind was received by the faithful under both species, afterwards it is taken by the celebrating [priests] under both species, and by laics only under the species of bread, since it is to be most firmly believed, and by no means doubted, that the whole body and blood of Christ are truly contained as well under the species of bread, as under the species of wine. Wherefore, since such a custom has been reasonably introduced by the Church and the Holy Fathers, and for a very long time has been observed, it is to be held for a law which it is not lawful to reprobate, or to change at will without the authority of the Church. For which cause, to say, that to observe this custom or law is sacrilegious or unlawful, ought to be judged erroneous: and they who pertinaciously assert the opposite to the premises, are to be repelled as heretics, and severely punished.

Likewise the holy synod itself decrees and declares upon that matter, that there be directed to the most reverend fathers in Christ, and lords, the patriarchs, primatis, archbishops, bishops, and their vicars in spirituals, any where constituted, processes in which it be entrusted to them, and commanded by the authority of this sacred Council under pain of excommunication, that they effectually punish those who, transgressing contrary to this decree, have encouraged the people in communicating under both kinds of bread and wine, and have taught that so it ought to be done.”

One cannot but remark the profane arrogance with which this Council overruled the fact, that our Saviour instituted

this Sacrament after supper, and administered it under both kinds to his disciples: and with an audacious "tamen hoc non obstante," set it aside as a thing of no moment, when compared with the authority of the Canons and the recent custom of the Church. Yet two Popes had said:—

"Abdicant enim se sacramento salutis humanæ, et Christum Dominum nostrum, sicut in veritate carnis nostræ denegent natum, ita vere mortuum et resurrexisse non credunt. Et ob hoc diem salutis et lætitiæ nostræ sui jejunii mœrore condemnant. Cumque ad tegendum infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant: ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt; sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem ut vobis hujuscemodi homines et his manifestentur indicibus, et quorum deprehensa fuerit sacrilega simulatio, notati et proditi a sanctorum societate sacerdotali auctoritate pellantur."—Leo Magn. Op. Lugd. 1633. Serm. iv. De Quadrag.

"Comperimus autem, quod quidam, sumpta tantum . . . corporis sacri portione, a calice sacrati cruoris absteineant. Qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur astringi) aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur; quia *divisio* unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest pervenire."—Gelasius de Con. dist. 2. in Concil. Gen. &c. (Col. Agrip. 1567, vol. ii. p. 292.

"For they deprive themselves of the sacrament of human salvation, and Christ our Lord, as they deny that He was born in the truth of our flesh, so also they believe not that He having truly died, rose also again. And therefore they condemn the day of our salvation and joy by the sadness of their fast. And when, in order to conceal their infidelity, they presume to be present in our mysteries, they so manage themselves in the communion of the sacraments, that they are sometimes more safely concealed: with unworthy mouth they take Christ's body; but they altogether decline to drink the blood of our redemption. This, therefore, we desire your holiness to know, so that men of this kind may be manifested to you even by these tokens, and that those whose sacrilegious simulation shall have been detected, being noted and brought forth, may be driven by sacerdotal authority from the society of the saints."

"We find, too, that some, having taken only a portion of the sacred body, abstain from the chalice of the hallowed blood. Who assuredly (since I know not by what superstition they are taught to be bound) must either take the whole sacraments, or be driven from the whole; because a division of one and the same mystery cannot come without grievous sacrilege."

What a striking illustration of the infallibility of the Pope!

APPENDIX B.B.

Referred to in p. 297. The concession to the Bohemians.

By the Council of Basle, October 29, 1435 (Conc. Gen. vol. iv. p. 238): the Moravians also were included in this concession.

About the year 1431, the year in which the Council of Basle assembled, Pope Clement VII. permitted communion under both kinds to the King of England, Edward III. ("ad gratiæ

augmentum : ” Gabr. Vasquez, ap. Calix. Disput. contra communionem sub una, CXXII. p. 175), a privilege which Richard II., in 1378, did not enjoy. (App. Z.) In 1346, the Emperor Sigismund, in the Compact of Iglau, conceded the cup to the Bohemians, by authority of the council then sitting, until a general decision should be given on the subject (Calixt. Disp. XLI.-XLIII. pp. 116-119) : but the Pope refused his sanction to the indulgence.

In 1548, the Emperor Charles V. permitted both kinds by an “ Interim ; ” and Pope Paul III. endeavoured to take the matter out of his hands by sending nuncios to empower the Bishops of Germany to make the concession to their dioceses. (Oratio Legati Bavar. apud Calixt. p. 18, and Calixt. pp. 28-35).

In 1556, Ferdinand, king of Hungary and Bohemia, permitted the cup to his subjects in Austria ; and his example was followed for a time by Albert, Duke of Bavaria, his son-in-law. (Calixt. p. 35 ; Sleidan. Comment. anno 1556, lib. XXVI. p. 509. Argent. 1558 ; and F. Paul’s Hist. Council of Trent, an. 1555, lib. V. p. 372, Lond. 1676.)

When the Council of Trent was sitting, the concession of the cup was earnestly sought from the Pope, by the Emperor, the Duke of Bavaria, the French, and the Poles. The Pope referred them to the Council, and the Council again, by its decree in the 22nd session, referred them and all others who might desire a like indulgence, to the Pope. (Calixt. p. 56, and F. Paul’s Hist. Council of Trent, lib. VI. p. 493, &c.) “ After assiduous and vehement sollicitation,” the Emperor and the Duke prevailed so far with the Pope in 1563, that communion in both kinds was permitted in their dominions, and letters were sent by the Pope to the Ecclesiastical Electors, to depute priests to administer in both kinds in their provinces. Cassander says that he saw one of these letters, and that the Emperor required his opinion, with other “ learned and prudent persons,” as to the mode in which the privilege should be imparted to his subjects. (Cassand. Ep. cxi. et apud Calixt. pp. 39-41.) But these indulgences, so far as the ecclesiastical authority interfered, were clogged with conditions which turned them almost into prohibitions. Still it is related, that according to the concession of Ferdinand, the communion in both kinds was administered to the people in the church of St. Stephen, at Vienna, in [July] 1564. (Abr. Bucholerus, apud Calixt. p. 79.) The edict was published at that time ; and it

states that the Pope had granted that, for the future, the Lord's Supper should be celebrated under both kinds. (*Ibid.* *Monit. ad Lectorem.*)

It has always been customary for the kings of France to receive the communion in both kinds at their coronation. Baronius (*Annal. An.* 1314, c. 22) gives the form of coronation prescribed "a Ludovico juniore," in which is this direction: "Absoluta missa Pares iterum Regem ante summum altare adducunto, ubi accipiunto communionem corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri de manu Archiepiscopi." Charles X. received both kinds at his coronation, 1825. (*Annual Register*, May 1825, p. 74.) In the Council of Trent, the French ambassadors "required that what determination soever they would make, it might not prejudice the use of the kings of France, who received the cup in their consecration, nor the custom of some monasteries of the kingdom, which did, at certain times, administer it." (*Hist. Conc. Trent*, lib. VI. an. 1562, p. 496, Lond. 1676.) And when the king of France, in discussing the subject with his divines, represented the custom at their coronations, they replied that their kings received the cup, because they were anointed as well as priests. (*Sleidan de Stat. Rel.*, an. 1535, p. 55, Argent. 1558.) But the spirit which decreed the "Gallican Liberties," needed no sanction of Pope or Council to retain the custom.

Pope Pius IV. is said to have made a proposal to Queen Elizabeth, to sanction the book of Common Prayer, and the communion in both kinds, on condition of her acknowledging his supremacy. Camden's *Hist. of Q. Elizabeth*, lib. I. an. 1560; Bishop Bull's *Vindic.* § 26; Twysden's *Vindic.* IX., 3rd ed. 1847; Bramhall, II. 85; Foxes and Firebrands, III. 17, 1682; Soames' *Ref.* IV. 725, 730; Harington's *Pius IV. and the Book of Common Prayer*, 1856.

APPENDIX C C.

Referred to in p. 297. Relaxation of the Constance decree by the Pope in favour of Deacons and others.

L'Arroque (pp. 143, 144) gives various testimonies from Cassander, *De Communionem sub utraque specie*, p. 1037.

The following are from Calixtus, who published a Dialogue

of Cassander's on this subject, with a disputation of his own. 4to. Helmstadt, 1642.

"Sane Concilii Constantiensis voluntatem non fuisse, utriusque speciei communionem tollere, aut semel omnibus laicis interdicare vel inde cum primis liqueat, quod absoluto Concilio Martinus ipse quintus utramque legatur Romæ administrasse speciem; quod non de Diacono Pontificis administro solum accipiendum est, sed et de populo. Testatur enim Reverendus P. Henricus Kaltisen Archiepiscopus Nidrosiensis. Martinum Romani reversum laicis sub utraque (ait) specie communicasse."—Lindan. Panoplia, l. IV. sub fin. apud Calixt. contra Com. sub una, p. 72.

"Nec negamus eis generaliter bibere Christi sanguinem secundum vini speciem: sed nec generaliter et sine discretionem concedimus universis. Nam seimus de consuetudine ecclesie relictum esse majorum prelatorum industria, ut de ministris altaris quosdam, aut alias personas illustres de vulgo, fide, reverentia, et omni timore Dei, præditas, ad hanc communicationem solennem in utraque specie possint admittere. Sicut interdum solet Papa, et alii quidam Episcopi, imo et inter fratres suos quidam religiosorum præpositi."—Thom. Waldensis de Sacrament. c. 94, apud Calixt. p. 108, 109.

This custom, however, did not long endure; for it was discontinued by Pope Martin himself, as is thus related:—

"Accidit ut quidam Bohemus baccalarius in medicinis, inter alios accederet, et sub utraque specie communicaret, qui de hoc mirabiliter gloriabatur, quod communio utriusque speciei facta esset sibi per summum Pontificem. Sed tandem in Viennâ captus et submersus est. Quod percipiens Papa Martinus sic sibi illum, ex tunc subtraxit calicis communionem laicis, nec umquam aliquem communicavit nisi sub specie panis tantum, in detestationem hæresis Bohemorum, et factæ sibi illusionis."—Kaltisen, in Cassand. Ep. XXX. apud Calixt. p. 48.

"Certainly, that it was not the will of the Council of Constance to take away communion of both species, or, once for all, to interdict all the laity, may be especially manifest from this, that when the Council was ended, Martin the fifth himself is said to have administered both species at Rome, which is not to be taken of the Deacon who attended the Pontiff, but also of the people. For the Reverend P. Henricus Kaltisen, Archbishop of Nidros, says that Martin when he returned to Rome communicated to the laity under both species."

"Nor do we deny them generally to drink the blood of Christ according to the species of wine: but neither do we concede it generally and without distinction to all. For we know that of the custom of the Church it was left to the care of the greater prelates, that they might admit certain of the ministers of the altar, or other illustrious persons of the public, endued with faith, reverence, and all fear of God, to this solemn participation in both species. As sometimes the Pope is accustomed, and certain other Bishops, and even certain Provosts of religious houses among their brethren."

"It happened when a certain Bohemian, a bachelor in medicine, came among others, and communicated under both species, who boasted wonderfully of this, that communion of both species had been given to him by the supreme Pontiff. But he was at length seized at Vienna and drowned. And Pope Martin seeing that he had been so deceived, thenceforth withdrew communion of the cup from the laity, and never communicated any but under the species of bread only, in detestation of the heresy of the Bohemians, and of the deceit practised upon him."

APPENDIX D D.

Referred to in p. 301. On the breaking of bread at Emmaus.

"To make of bread a Sacrament, it is absolutely necessary, according to them, that Christ should say, *This is my body*, which here He said not"—i.e. is not related to have said:—"if they rejoin, that this is to be

understood, I say, with as much reason, that *wine*, the usual concomitant of a supper, is to be understood; and so here will be no example of *communicating in one kind*."—Whitby in loc. See Matt. xiv. 19; Mark vi. 41, viii. 6.

Eating, or breaking, bread, was the common name for their meals amongst the Jews. See Matt. xv. 3; Mark iii. 20, vii. 2, 5, &c.

"As the Greeks, from one part, namely drinking, called the whole action *συμπόσιον*, a drinking together: so the Hebrews denominated the whole feast, from the eating and breaking of bread. They therefore who abuse these places of St. Luke for defence of communion under one kind; do not err less childishly, than if they should say that in the Grecian feasts no food was set before the guests, and nothing at all but wine or some other beverage."—Casaubon. Exercit. xvi. Num. xxxviii. p. 466.

APPENDIX E E.

Referred to in p. 317. On the time when our Lord offered Himself.

A recent author, Mr. Milton, in three sermons, entitled "The Eucharist Illustrated," builds his doctrine on the assumption that our Lord spiritually offered Himself in the temple in the sacrifice of the lamb of which He partook when He was about to institute the Eucharist: and that it was by virtue of this offering of Himself, He was enabled to make the Apostles partakers of his body broken and his blood shed, before He actually suffered.

Mr. Milton says:—

"He who was so careful to fulfil all righteousness, to perform His every duty as a faithful son of Israel, cannot be absent now, 'when it is a bounden duty to sacrifice the Passover.' Fix, dear brethren, the eye of faith upon that company. He is attended by His family, His chosen disciples. As the head of the house, He Himself, it may be on His own sacred shoulders, has borne the lamb for an offering. He Himself offers it in sacrifice.—He stands by in solemn earnest devotion, while the blood of the Lamb without blemish and without spot is devoted to God. He joins Himself in spirit to that action, and therein, in all the intensity of His Spiritual being, He offers Himself to His Father, in spirit and in truth. What a Paschal sacrifice was that! Fifteen hundred Passovers were gathered together in that action, and at that hour. The types of thousands of years of sacrifice had reached, at last, their substance and fulfilment. He, the true Lamb of God, the Lamb without blemish and without spot, was then offering Himself in spirit, devoting Himself in sacrifice to God. His hour was

now come. It is of this spiritual offering of Himself that the Apostle speaks, when he says, that 'Christ, through the Eternal Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God' (Heb. ix. 14)."

— "He took bread, He blessed God, and gave Him thanks. He brake the bread, He gave it to His disciples: 'Take, eat; this is My Body, which is given for you.' He took the cup, He blessed God; and gave Him thanks. He gave the cup to His disciples: 'This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you.' Thus He celebrated and gave to them the Feast upon the Sacrifice—the spiritual feast upon the spiritual sacrifice. The spiritual sacrifice, as we have seen, He had already made, when in the Temple courts He offered Himself in the devotion of His Spirit, while the Lamb that represented Him and them was being sacrificed to God. And now He keeps the spiritual feast upon that sacrifice made in spirit and in truth. We must not think that the Feast of the Lord's Supper was in anticipation of the sacrifice that was to be made the next day on the Cross. The feast could not precede the sacrifice. It never has done: it never can do so. And further, that was to be a corporal sacrifice; this, on the contrary, is a spiritual feast."—

"He offered Himself—to God, as He stood in the Temple court of Jerusalem, and, in the outward visible sign of the death of His Offered Lamb, laid down His life, in spirit and in mystery, a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world."—

"'This is my Body, which is being given for you.' 'This is my Blood, which is being poured out for you.' Our Lord could thus speak, because the great offering of His life, His body, His blood, had commenced. The spiritual sacrifice had been already made; and therefore the spiritual feast upon that sacrifice could even now be given; and the fruit of that sacrifice could even now, in spiritual strength and grace, be communicated to the faithful. His sacred Body was yet unwounded, His precious Blood yet flowed in unsevered stream within His sacred veins. Yet, by reason of the spiritual offering of Himself that He had already made, He could say of Himself in that hour, 'Now is the Son of Man glorified,' and in spiritual power His flesh was even now the life of the world; and in His blood the New Covenant was already made in spiritual truth with the Father.—

"How often do we ask ourselves, 'How can our Communion upon the Body and Blood of Christ after His Crucifixion and His Ascension into Glory, at all resemble that First Communion given by our Lord to His disciples in the Upper Chamber? What we receive as the consequences of His death, how could they receive before that death took place?' And to these questionings no answer can be given, until we understand that the spiritual sacrifice had preceded the Communion as truly as it has preceded our Communion; and that, therefore, the spiritual feast founded thereupon, could be as truly given unto them as it is given unto us. Only after an heavenly and spiritual manner do we receive. There is no corporal receiving, no carnal eating of the crucified Body of our Lord, or of His outshed Blood. All was, all is, spiritual and true. The spiritual offering of Himself by Christ gave a boundless power of spiritual commu-

nication to the Body and Blood which He offered; and the spiritual communication was as true to His Apostles in the Upper Chamber as it is to us at the Lord's Table; and was the same to them before His Crucifixion as it is to us after that event. It needed not then, as it needs not now, an impossible presence of His Body in the Bread that He held in His hand, nor of His Blood in the cup. They were symbols to their sight, assurances to their faith." *

The spiritual sacrifice of Himself, made in the temple at the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb, and the Communion of this sacrifice having been given to the Apostles and instituted for the Church,

"the darkness of a great sorrow—has fallen upon the soul of my Saviour. The great struggle of all is at hand, strong mental distress and agitation of soul. 'He began to be sorrowful and very heavy.'—For now the second particular of His Great Sacrifice has to be performed; and it is by far the most severe of all. It is the sacrifice of His soul, of His human will, that He is now about to make, following upon that sacrifice in the spirit which He had rejoiced to make in holy devotion in the Temple courts.—His spirit had been wholly willing, and had made the offering in full devotion; and so continued firmly set; but the flesh was weak; the human will, swayed by human motions and emotions, was sorely exercised now in the final hour of choice.—He made the great sacrifice of His will, of His soul to God, in the Agony of Gethsemane.—And from that moment He went wholly resigned, wholly without agitation, to finish on the Cross, the Great, the Perfect Sacrifice. The third, the last particular is come—the offering of the body,—completing the devotion of the spirit and the sacrifice of the soul.—His body bore its consummating part and the Great Sacrifice is completed in all the perfection of our Lord's incarnate nature, in the threefold strength of Spirit, Soul, and Body. He exclaims, 'It is finished.'"

"All this is but one single sacrifice."

"Of these three parts the last is the most visible, and that by which we speak of the whole, and yet it is the least truly the act of the worshipper himself [in the offering of sacrifice]. So on the cross, Christ's Blood was shed by the hands of others, viz., the priests and their agents, who crucified the Lord. It was in the devout offering made by His spirit at the sacrifice in the Temple courts; it was in the self-denying, costly dedication of His soul in the consent of His will completed in the Agony in the Garden, that Jesus specially fulfilled His words, and 'laid down His life of Himself, when no man took it from Him.' Was not His act of sacrifice complete, as far as He Himself was the agent, when after the Agony was passed, He went forward and delivered Himself up to His destroyers?" †

Profoundly interesting and impressive, however, and very ingenious, as these representations are, this theory, of the

* Pp. 3, 4; 6, 7; 8, 9, 10.

† Pp. 11-15.

sacrifice of our Lord spiritually made by Himself at the sacrifice of the lamb in the temple, and of the communion of that sacrifice given to the Apostles before He suffered, and to the Church since his ascension, is built upon an assumed fact, of which there is not the slightest particle of evidence. It assumes that our Lord "attended" in the temple, and Himself offered the Paschal lamb in sacrifice; and this, as a duty binding upon Him.

Now there is not a single word, in the accounts given to us by the Evangelists, which can be alleged for this. There is not the remotest intimation that He attended in the temple on that occasion. There is not the remotest intimation that He offered sacrifice either then, or at any other time. The facts related, and true theology, determine the very contrary.

We read that "Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed. And He sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat. And they said unto Him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee, that thou mayest eat the passover? And He said unto them, Go ye into the city to such a man,—and he shall shew you a large upper room furnished and prepared; there make ready for us. And his disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as He had said unto them; and they made ready the passover." On "the day—when the passover must be killed," He being without the city, sent his disciples into the city, to "prepare the passover." Two days before He had been in the temple; but He was then in Bethany, in the Mount of Olives: * and clearly He was not in Jerusalem. He sent his disciples into the city from the place where He then was: and they went into the city, and prepared as He had directed them to do. "And in the evening He cometh with the twelve." † The lamb was not killed, when He sent the disciples to prepare that He might eat. The preparation necessarily involved the sacrifice of the lamb; and this was done by the disciples who were sent to prepare it, and not by Jesus. He, therefore, did not attend in the temple with them at the sacrifice, nor offer the sacrifice Himself. The real facts refute the assumed fact.

But true theology is irreconcilably opposed to the notion that our Lord ever offered any of the sacrifices of the temple: I have shown in previous pages the signification of sacrifice,

* Mark xiv. 1, 3; Luke xxii. 22-37.

† Mark xiv. 17.

and the language in which it is to be interpreted. I have shown that all sacrifice was for sin: that it was a confession of sin and consequent desert of death: a deprecation of this recompense: and an act of trust in God for pardon. And to Him who was without sin, sacrifice could not be fitting in any one of its characters. He could not confess sin. He could not deprecate its wages. He could have no pardon to implore, or to trust that God would grant.

Perhaps it may be said, that if our Lord did not offer sacrifice, yet He did eat of the sacrifice. This is plainly stated, and we must believe it. But it makes nothing against the observations I have made. All sacrifices were to God. They were all given up to Him. And He was universally conceived to accept the sacrifice duly offered, and to smell the sweet savour of them. He was conceived to participate in them, to take his part in them. And so our Lord could Himself participate in the sacrifice, and eat the passover, without any implication of sin or of his offering sacrifice for it.

The spiritual sacrifice, therefore, of our Lord by Himself, in the temple at the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb, is a pure invention, based on a fact which is assumed without evidence,—indeed against evidence,—and is derogatory to the character of Him who was without sin, without blemish and without spot. His whole life upon earth may be called a spiritual sacrifice, which culminated in, and was perfected by, his literal sacrifice upon the cross. And this sacrifice upon the cross it is which we are taught by holy Scripture to regard as the sacrifice of Christ.

Nor is the distinction true, which Mr. Milton makes between the sacrifice of the Spirit and Soul, and the sacrifice of the Body, of Christ: that in the two former parts of his “one sacrifice,” He Himself was the agent; but that in the latter, the priests were the agents. True, they crucified Him, they were the instruments of his sacrifice: but they “knew not what they did.” As for his sacrifice, they were utterly unconscious of it; and were but the instruments of its oblation. He made use of them for it, as offerers in the temple made use of the implements of death. And He who could have commanded legions of angels; who had but to will it, and all, like the “band of men and officers” in the garden, would have fallen backward to the ground; who at the very moment of his death, cried with such a voice, as extorted from the heathen centurion the

declaration that "He was the Son of God": * had his will as free, his power as undiminished, and was in all senses as truly the agent, as He could be in a previous sacrifice of his spirit and his soul.

This spiritual sacrifice of our Lord by Himself in the temple at the offering of the Paschal lamb, Mr. Milton makes the foundation of his doctrine of the Eucharist. "The spiritual sacrifice," he says, our Lord "had already made" before the supper. "And now He keeps the spiritual feast upon that sacrifice.—We must not think that the Feast of the Lord's Supper was in anticipation of the sacrifice that was to be made the next day on the Cross. The feast could not precede the sacrifice. It never has done: it never can do so." But why could not the feast precede the sacrifice? The sacrifice, he justly alleges, "was to be a corporal sacrifice": but the feast, "on the contrary, is a spiritual feast." And for this very reason, that it is a spiritual feast, it could precede as well as follow, the sacrifice. The Israelites "did all eat—spiritual meat, and did all drink spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." † They feasted upon Christ, and therefore upon his sacrifice, hundreds of years before it was offered.

Again: "the spiritual sacrifice had been already made; and therefore the spiritual feast upon that sacrifice could even now be given; and the fruit of that sacrifice could even now, in spiritual strength and grace, be communicated to the faithful.—The spiritual feast founded thereupon, could be as truly given unto them as it is given unto us." But the feast,—the subject of the feast—is not on the spiritual sacrifice, upon the sacrifice of our Lord by Himself in spirit, or in spirit and in soul,—but upon his body which was given for us, and his blood which was shed for us. And as we participate in that feast by the faith, that his body was given for us and his blood shed for us: so by a like faith that He was giving his body, and that it was to be broken, and his blood was to be shed for them, the Apostles could participate in it even before He did actually suffer. At no time since He suffered, nor at the very moment and view of his death, could any have feasted on his body and blood, as He taught, but by faith: and the same faith had power to feast on them before He suffered, and from the very

* Mark xv. 39.

† 1 Cor. x. 3, 4.

foundation of the world. The feast, then, could precede, and did precede, the sacrifice : and the Apostles enjoyed that feast as really as those who participated after the sacrifice.

APPENDIX F F.

Referred to in p. 365. On the use of the word *ποιεῖτε*.

Mr. Malan has some very scholarly observations, which I must here transcribe.

“What other words,” (he asks,) “could our Saviour have used in order to say, ‘Do this,’ in the sense in which the Fathers, all the old and the authorised versions take it in this place? None. Therefore does the *onus probandi* rests on those who of their mere will say that here *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* means ‘make’ or ‘offer this.’ They will, however, find it difficult to prove. For—

“We must carefully distinguish between the meaning inherent in a word, and idiomatic acceptations of it. When, therefore, Aristotle tells us very truly *τὸ ποιεῖν πολλαχῶς λέγεται* (Eth. v. 9, 11), that *ποιεῖν* is said in various ways, he means that ‘to make’ and ‘to do,’ which are the meanings inherent in *ποιεῖν*, are said of rational and irrational as well as of inanimate beings, and that *ποιεῖν* is idiomatically used in many ways, the particular idiom consisting in saying ‘to make’ or ‘to do’ in a peculiar way.

“Thus, *ποιεῖν θυσίαν, facere sacrificium*, must be rendered into English, ‘to offer a sacrifice,’ because ‘to make a sacrifice,’ the literal rendering of the Greek and Latin, though correct, and also idiomatic, has nevertheless a different meaning. In the New Testament alone we are obliged to render *ποιεῖν* not only by ‘to make’ and ‘to do,’ but by ‘to bring forth’ (fruit), ‘to tarry’ a season, ‘to gain’ or ‘to traffic,’ ‘to keep or celebrate’ the Passover or a feast, ‘to shoot or put forth,’ branches, ‘to call together’ a council, ‘to commit’ murder, ‘to have’ pity, ‘to make’ a dinner or supper; wherein *ἄριστον ποιεῖν* differs from the classic *ἀριστοποιεῖν* or *ἀριστοποιῆσαι*, that means ‘to dine’ or ‘eat the early meal.’

“The same thing,” (he says in a note,) “occurs in all languages. Thus, ‘to make a bed’ properly means to put together a bedstead; but it is idiomatically said of preparing a bed on which to lie.”—

“*Ποιεῖν θυσίαν*, said in the LXX of legal offerings, does not once occur in the New Testament, in which mention is made of *πνευματικαὶ θυσίαι*, ‘spiritual sacrifices’ only, to be offered up by the holy priesthood, which ‘as lively stones are built up a spiritual house.’ For “these sacrifices are : (1), *θυσία πίστεως*, sacrifice of faith (Phil. ii. 7); (2), *θυσία αἰνέσεως*, sacrifice of praise (Heb. xiii. 15); (3), *ἐνδοξίας καὶ κοινωνίας*, of well-doing (Heb. xiii. 16); (4), gifts and alms and other acts of charity, as *θυσίαν ἕκκτην καὶ ἐνάρπστον τῷ Θεῷ*, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing

unto God (Phil. iv. 18); (5), our bodies, as *θυσίαν ζῶσαν*, a living sacrifice, holy, and acceptable unto God (Rom. xii. 1). ‘*Ορᾶς*, says St. Chrysostom, *οἷαίς θυσίαις ἐναρσεστέϊται ὁ Θεός*, thou seest with what sacrifices God is well pleased: *αὕτη θυσία καλή, οὐ δειομένη ἱερέωι, ἀλλ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ προσφέροντος* (not *ποιούντος*) *αὐτήν*; ‘that is a good sacrifice which requires no priest, but him alone who offers it; it is a good sacrifice, offered indeed here below, yet at once accomplished in heaven.’ (Homil. in Heb. xi.) Wherefore the same Father, comparing the kind of sacrifices and oblations under the Law with the spiritual sacrifices of the New Testament, says: *ἐκινή μὲν χειροποίητος, αὐτὴ δὲ ἀχειροποίητος*; the first was of sacrifices made with hand, but the second of sacrifices made without hand.”—(Ibid. xix.) The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, pp. 66, 67, 69. See also pp. 38–41.

It is worth while to transcribe the following also from Mr. Malan’s work, in reference to the “continuous sacrifice.”

“Chrysostom says,—when thou hearest Him spoken of as High Priest, think not that He is always performing the ministerial functions of that office. He did it once, and after that sat down. And lest thou shouldest imagine that He is now in heaven standing and doing the service of the priesthood, the Apostle shews that such service is a part of the dispensation. As He became a servant, so also was He made both High Priest and Minister. But in like manner also, as when He became a servant, He did not continue such; so also, when made a minister, did He not continue in that office; for it is not the part of a minister to sit down, but to stand. This, then, gives us to understand the greatness and majesty of the sacrifice, which alone, and offered once, yet sufficed to do what all the other sacrifices could not do. Therefore does the holy Apostle state the matter up and down, fully and clearly, saying, There is one High Priest and one sacrifice only; lest any one should think there are many, and thus err grievously.

“Since, then, the sacrifice of Christ put an end to all others, we see why in the New Testament we hear of no other sacrifices than spiritual ones, and of no other priesthood than of ‘the holy priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, by Jesus Christ.’ (1 Pet. ii. 5; Rev. i. 6; xx. 6.) So truly do the sacrifices and the priesthood go together, both being spiritual. Wherefore did the Apostles call themselves *πρεσβύτεροι*, presbyters (2 Pet. v. 5), and not *ἱερεῖς*, priests, in the sense of sacrificers; and the Eucharist did they call the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor. xi. 20), and not *θυσία*, a sacrifice; in order, we may be sure, to draw all possible contrast between themselves and the Mosaic dispensation.”—Pp. 77, 78.

APPENDIX G G.

P. 372.—The sacrifice of Cain.

Archdeacon Freeman says:—

“The idea that Cain’s [sacrifice] was rejected because it did not consist of a lamb or other animal, is contradicted by the whole experience of later ages, in which the other kind of sacrifices enjoyed a distinct recognition, and very exalted privileges; and also by the language of St. Paul. (In Heb. xi. 1, Abel’s is only called a *better* (or larger, *πλείονα*) sacrifice than Cain’s; it is not even hinted that Cain’s was no sacrifice at all, or that it was incapable of acceptance).”—Principles of Div. Service, ii. 52.

I am unable, however, to see any contradiction in this passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews to “the idea that Cain’s sacrifice was rejected, because it did not consist of a lamb or other animal.” On the contrary, I think it very clearly confirms this idea, in calling Abel’s “a larger sacrifice”: for this is to say, that Cain’s was not large enough, or in other words, that it was insufficient: and its insufficiency not only may have been in this very point, that it did not consist of a sacrifice involving shedding of blood; but actually was in this very point, as the bare history testifies in the only distinction which it relates between the sacrifices of the two brothers. Abel’s was of “the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof”; but Cain’s was of “the fruit of the ground” (Gen. iv. 4, 3). This was the difference between the two sacrifices: the one had “shedding of blood,” and the other had not. And in this, the one was “a larger” sacrifice, and the other insufficient. And the one was expressive of a faith, in which the other was deficient. What, then, was that faith? It was a faith “by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts”: he obtained forgiveness of his unrighteousness, the Lord having “respect unto him and his offering,” and thus testifying that his “sins were forgiven, and his iniquity covered.” And we know, that “without shedding of blood is no remission.”

But the Archdeacon, in reality, answers himself, when he goes on to say:—

“It should be observed, however, that under the Mosaic system the acceptability and sacrificial efficacy of the offering of fruits of the earth was, as we shall see hereafter, conditional. 1. If it was a private sacrifice, the circumstances of the offerer must be such as to justify the simple gift: and 2. It must in any case be conceived of as standing in lieu of, or in close relation to, a *slain* offering; that kind alone possessing, in strictness and *per se*, any sacrificial power. The first of these conditions, Cain, as

having no flock of his own, fulfilled : but it is most probable that his rejection was caused by his disregard of the second ; by his failing to acknowledge the necessary and proper inferiority of his bloodless offering to those of the class to which his brother's belonged ; and so by his want of faith in the already revealed principle, that ' without shedding of blood is no remission.' ”

And here again, it must be observed, that we cannot take it for granted that “ Cain, as having no flock of his own, fulfilled ” the first of these conditions. “ The circumstances of the offerer,” to which the allusion is made as being “ such as to justify the simple gift ” of a bloodless sacrifice, were his not being “ able to bring ” even “ two turtle doves ” (Lev. v. 11). But this does not at all appear to have been the case with Cain. He had “ fruits of the ground,” and might, by an easy exchange, have obtained from Abel a “ firstling of his flock : ” and thus might have offered as “ large ” a sacrifice.

APPENDIX H H.

Referred to in p. 381. Our Lord offered no sacrifice but of Himself.

In Appendix E E I have remarked upon Mr. Milton's assumed fact, that our Lord Himself, in the temple court at Jerusalem, slew and offered the Paschal lamb, of which He had been partaking with the Apostles, when He instituted the Eucharist. And I have said that this assumption is not only unsupported by any evidence, but is inconsistent with the inspired history, and is irreconcilably opposed to true theology.

Of the history I have given a sufficient abstract in Appendix E E : and with regard to the untheological character of the assumption, I may further refer to pp. 331, 332 of the present work.

One would, indeed, think the assumption of our Lord ever offering any of the sacrifices of the law, must be sufficiently disproved by the fact, that He is never said at any time to have offered such sacrifices. But Mr. Milton says, that it was his “ duty, his bounden duty, as a faithful son of Israel, to sacrifice the Passover : ” and, of course, if this was his duty, it would be his duty also to offer all the other sacrifices of the law. But if He was “ a faithful son of Israel,” He was also without sin, and was moreover the Lord and the God of Israel. And if He was “ made under the law,” as we know He was, it was not to

offer sacrifice for Himself, but by the sacrifice of Himself, "to redeem them that were under the law."* He had no "sins" for which He had "to offer." He had not "to offer for Himself," but "for the people;" and He certainly offered no sacrifice of the law for them. He was not compassed with infirmity," like the High Priests of the law, "by reason of which He ought—to offer for Himself—for sins." But He "offered Himself"—Himself only,— "without spot to God": and "neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." †

To say that He offered any sacrifice but of Himself, is, in reality, to impute sin to Him who had no sin.

APPENDIX II.

Referred to in p. 395. On the alleged sacrifice of Melchisedek.

Canon Trevor well says:—

"It is idle to argue from what is *not* stated in Scripture against what *is*. The Fathers, if they had been unanimous, could not make a type out of a rite neither recorded in the Old Testament, nor expounded in the New. But the Fathers are not unanimous. S. Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp, have no mention of this type. It is not found among the numerous similitudes of Barnabas and Hermas. Iræneus is ignorant of it, and Justin Martyr, who ransacked the Old Testament for types, and found the Eucharist in the law and in the prophets, never lighted upon it in the more obvious symbols of Melchisedek.

"The first to apply the incident to the Eucharist was Clement of Alexandria, and he limits the type to the communion, without reference to any sacrifice (Strom. IV.). Tertullian, who speaks of Melchisedek's sacrifice (Adv. Jud.), does not expound it of the Eucharist. Origen, the most learned Hebraist of all, supposed Melchisedek to be an angel, and knew nothing of his sacrifice. S. Cyprian is the first to adduce it as a type of the Eucharistic sacrifice. After him it was held by Eusebius, Athanasius, and Jerome, and so passed into a common opinion. It was never inserted, however, in the Liturgies or decrees of faith till the Council of Trent, and there it was long stoutly denied. Jeremy Taylor admits it, but Bishop Andrewes confidently affirms of Melchisedek, 'sacrificium nullum obtulit.'" —Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrifice and Participation of the Holy Eucharist. Pp. 23, 24.

* Gal. iv. 4, 5.

† Heb. v. 2, 3; ix. 14, 12.

Outram well and forcibly argues :—

“Qui vero Aaronem aliis rebus, aliis Melchisedecum ad sacrificia usum judicant, Aaronem iid, quæ ante diximus, animalibus perinde ac inanimis, Melchisedecum nihil nisi pane et vino, hi sane, quantum mihi videtur, quare sic judicent, nihil habent. Panem hic et vinum Abrahamo et vernis ejus jam ex itinere, prælioque fessis ad vires reficiendas dedit. Similemque simili in causa morem finitimis fuisse regionibus non obscure docet historia sacra (Deut. xxiii. 4, et Jud. viii. 5, 6, 15): neque Melchisedecus sacerdos dicitur, quia panem illum et vinum protulit, sed ut hinc quisque intelligeret, quæ factum erat, ut Abrahamo solenni ritu benediceret, id quod sacerdotis fuit (Deut. xxi. 5, et 1 Par. xxiii. 13, et Num. vi. 23); tum etiam, quare Abrahamus spoliiorum decimas ei dederat.—Nihil ergo est, cur Melchisedecum pane solummodo atque vino, nihil, quare rebus tantum inanimis sacrificasse arbitremur. Imo vero est, quamobrem contra judicemus. Si enim a sacerdotio ejus aliena fuissent cruenta sacra, quæ factum est, ut ipse Christus, cujus idem quod Melchisedeci fuit, sacerdotii genus esse dicitur, sanguine suo sacrificaret?”—De Sacrificiis II. I. ii. pp. 288, 289. Lond. 1677. (372).

“They who determine that Aaron and Melchisedek used different sacrifices from each other, that Aaron used those which we have before mentioned, animal and inanimate sacrifices alike; that Melchisedek used nothing but bread and wine; these certainly, so far as I can see, have no reason why they so determine. He here gave bread and wine to Abraham and his servants now wearied with their journey and battle, to recruit their strength. And that the neighbouring countries had a like custom on like occasions the sacred history clearly teaches. Nor is Melchisedek called a priest, because he brought forth that bread and wine, but that from his being so called everyone might understand how it came to pass, that he blessed Abraham in solemn rite, as it belonged to a priest to do: and also for what reason it was, that Abraham gave him tithes of the spoils. No reason therefore is there, why we should think that Melchisedek sacrificed exclusively with bread and wine; no reason to think that he sacrificed with inanimate things only. But just the reverse: there is reason why we should determine the contrary. For if bloody rites had been alien to his priesthood, how comes it, that Christ Himself, whose priesthood is said to be of the same kind as that of Melchisedek, should sacrifice with His own blood?”

I must here transcribe part of a very judicious letter in the British Magazine for December 1834, p. 656, signed E. B., evidently the late Dr. Edward Burton, Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

“I cannot think your correspondent is sufficiently supported by clear and unquestionable authority, when he founds any claim for the Christian priesthood on their offering ‘the Melchisedekian sacrifice.’ Admitting that the offering of Melchisedek was *typical* of the future Christian sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, (which, after all that has been said, is still little more than conjectural, and rests on *human* authority only,) I cannot perceive how our Lord (from whom we derive our appointment of Christian ministers) can, in this respect, be called ‘an High Priest after the order of Melchisedek,’ with any shew of sufficient evidence: nor consequently, how in A. P. P.’s [Mr. Perceval’s] words, ‘the priesthood which is claimed for the Christian ministry is’ (on this ground) ‘a share in our Lord’s priesthood, a priesthood after the order of Melchisedek.’ The only part of the inspired writings which throws any light, and that but partial, on the mysterious character of the King of Salem, is St. Paul’s seventh chapter to the Hebrews. He had indeed said in chap. v. 10, ‘Of whom we have many

things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing'; but as he *did not* say them, being so highly mysterious, we are left to draw our conclusions from what he *did* say, and must venture most warily in stepping beyond 'what has been written,' however plausible our grounds may appear, however venerable our authorities, lest we lose ourselves, and perhaps others, in the mazes of fanciful and very doubtful conjecture. Now in St. Paul's somewhat lengthened notice of Melchisedek, not one word is said, nor the slightest allusion made to the fact of his 'bringing forth bread and wine,' (the whole that is said on this subject in Gen. xiv. 18,) nor is the smallest hint given of any resemblance between Christ and him on these grounds. The whole resemblance, so far as St. Paul describes it, is made to consist (independently of the figurative character of his name, 'King of *Righteousness*, and king of Salem, i.e. of *Peace*, ver. 2) in the *peculiar and singular nature of his priesthood*. He was a priest (unlike those of Aaron's line) without genealogical descent—'Without father, without mother, without descent; having neither beginning of days, nor end of life,' (without predecessor or successor,) '*but made like unto the Son of God*,' he 'abideth a priest continually;' ver. 13. Again, vv. 14–17: 'For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood. And it is yet far more evident; for that *after the similitude* of Melchisedek there ariseth another priest, who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.' Surely, then, these being, by the Apostle's account, the grounds of resemblance, we are hardly justified in *asserting*, on *any* uninspired authority, similarity on any other grounds, however ancient or plausible; nor to rest on so insecure and debateable an argument a claim for the validity of the Christian priesthood, as the duly constituted and apostolically descended 'ministers in holy things pertaining to the gospel'—(*ἱερουργοῦντες τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*)—Rom. xv. 16 (see Suicer on *ἱεροῦργεω*, with the authorities he quotes). Not to mention that it is hardly probable that St. Paul would have omitted to notice so striking a prefiguration of the Christian sacrament, had it unquestionably borne a typical character—a type more striking, *as such*, than any which the Mosaic services can shew.

"In his reference to the prophet 'Malachi' also, in further corroboration of his argument, I conceive that A. P. P. is equally treading on insecure ground. The passage to which he refers is chap. i. 11.—Without asserting that he is unquestionably mistaken in applying this ('Mincha') to the Christian oblation of bread and wine, I think it will be impossible for him to *prove* his application on sufficient, i.e. undoubted, authority; and if the argument is good as regards 'the mincha,' it must surely be equally good as regards the *whole* offering, and include *material incense* as well as material 'mincha,' which I believe has never been pretended to be the case. *Half* can hardly be *figurative*, and half *real*, in such an instance as this. The truth seems to be that, the language is simply figurative, and intended to express the pure and spiritual worship which, under the Gospel, should entirely supersede the ceremonial and ritual worship of the Jewish altar.

That offering of prayer and praise, those ‘sacrifices of a broken and contrite heart,’ those holy services, ‘that reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice,’ by which and with which all faithful Christians should ‘worship the Father in spirit and in truth;’ which also, I conceive, (and not *material* oblations,) are equally intended in those passages of the Apostolical writings which describe Christians *generally* as ‘a holy nation, a royal priesthood,’ ‘a holy priesthood, to offer up *spiritual* sacrifices, acceptable to God, by Jesus Christ;’ (1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. Compare also Isaiah lxi. 6, referred to by A. P. P. with Rev. v. 11, and xx. 6; though these passages touch on that ‘*vexata quæstio*,’ the Millennium.) Let me not be supposed in these remarks, as intending to impugn either the doctrine of ‘oblation,’ in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, or the validity of the Christian minister’s title to the priestly character and office. Myself a minister of the Church of England, and appreciating as highly as any of my brethren the apostolical character and claims of our holy order, I would yield to none either in ‘magnifying mine office,’ or in raising the Sacraments of our Church to their *highest* solemnity and importance, as ‘means of grace’; the more to be valued the better they are understood, both in their *nature* and their *objects*. But I do think that no arguments should be brought forward in support of any doctrine or practice of our Church which will not bear the most rigid examination, and admit of the most unquestionable defence.—In all statements in support and proof of the doctrines of our Church, we surely cannot too carefully guard against the danger of giving our adversaries any, even the smallest advantages, by appearing to seek defences in arguments which *must* be, in their very nature, only *speculative*, and may possibly be unfounded in truth.—There are grounds enough of defence, and arguments enough of *constraining* force, weapons enough in our holy armoury to fight the Lord’s battle, and to defend the cause of our Church, without venturing upon debateable positions, the consequence of which may be to unsettle the faith of many whom we should seek by all means to ‘build up,’ and to ‘give occasion to the enemies of God,’ and Christ, ‘to blaspheme.’”

It may be added, that as Forbes cites Cajetan, the Cardinal “frankly owns that from the famous passage, ‘Melchisedek, King of Salem, brought forth,’ or as others render it, ‘offered,’ ‘bread and wine, and he was’ (according to others, ‘for he was’) ‘the priest of the Most High God; and he blessed him,’ it cannot be demonstratively proved that Melchisedek offered bread and wine to God; and therefore that the argument which is taken from the priesthood of Melchisedek (however he may have been a figure of Christ and of His priesthood) in order to prove that Christ in the last supper offered the bread and wine to God, is deficient in force. ‘Nothing,’ he says, ‘is here written about a sacrifice or oblation, but about the bringing forward or taking out, which Josephus mentions as having been done to refresh the conquerors.’* Pagninus and Vatablus agree with him, and P. Picherellus at greater length than any of them.”†

* “Nihil hic scribitur de sacrificio seu oblatione, sed de prolatione seu extractione, quam Josephus dicit factam ad reficiendum victores.”—Cajetan. in locum.

† Forbes, *Considerationes Modestæ*, Lib. III.; De Eucharistia, i. 4, Oxford, 1856 II. 566.

APPENDIX K K.

Referred to in p. 506. The body and blood of Christ are not whole Christ.

We find in some ancient and some modern writers, an opinion that since we receive the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, we receive Christ Himself. Clement of Alexandria says that He "who is both bread and flesh, giveth Himself who is both, to eat." Dionysius of Alexandria speaks of "His giving Himself to us in the Mystical Supper." Ambrose says: "In that Sacrament Christ is, because it is the body of Christ." St. Augustine says: "to us that is Christ which is placed on the altar of God": He was "carried in his own hands."

Bishop Overall, according to Mr. Knox, says more explicitly: "In the Sacrament of the Eucharist, or the Lord's Supper, the body and blood of Christ, and therefore the whole of Christ, is verily and indeed present, and is verily partaken by us, and verily combined with the sacramental signs." And again: "the body and blood of Christ, and thus whole Christ." Even Bishop Andrewes says: "ubi corpus, ubi sanguis, ibi Christus, I am sure."

Now, with all due reverence for so great names, and for those who may have used such unguarded words, it must be clearly and decisively stated, that the body and blood of Christ are not Christ, or whole Christ. The very mention of his body—and—blood implies the absence of that essential constituent of the Person of Christ,—His soul. Whole Christ, the whole Person of Christ, is his body, his soul, and his Godhead, in living union. But when we speak of his body—and—blood, we do not, or ought not to, mean his body with the blood all in it; but his body and his blood, separately from each other: the body, therefore, in the state of death, and the soul sent forth from it, or given up, as it is written that it was on the cross.

Though, therefore, it is in one sense true, that "where is the body and the blood of Christ, there Christ is": it is true only in this way, that by receiving the body and the blood of Christ, we are made one with Him. Our receiving his body and blood is the cause; our receiving Him is the effect. But the body and blood of Christ are not "whole Christ."

We must not deny, or imply a denial, that Christ had "a reasonable soul," as well as "human flesh": for this were manifest heresy. But the notion that the body and blood of

Christ are whole Christ, so heretical as it is, has had much influence in the fashioning of Eucharistic doctrine; and, therefore, necessarily, in corrupting it. The doctrine of "The Real Objective Presence" is in part founded upon and involves it; whether that doctrine be enounced in the Roman, or the Lutheran, or the Tractarian form. It partakes of that heresy, and must be condemned with it.

I am glad to refer the reader to some very just observations in relation to the question touched on in this Appendix, to Archdeacon Freeman's Principles of Divine Service, Introduction to part II., sect. xii., pp. 141-153: and to Canon Trevor's recent work, The Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrifice and Participation of the Holy Eucharist, pp. 48, 49.

INDEX

OF THE TEXTS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE REFERRED TO OR TREATED OF
IN THIS WORK.



GENESIS

	PAGE
i. 3	64
ii. 17	331
iii. 8	558
iv. 4, 3	594
iv. 7	372
xiv. 18, 19	365
xvii. 22	558
xviii. 33	558
xxxv. 13	558
xliii. 16	411

EXODUS

iii. 4	558
x. 25	364
xi. 19	351
xii. 8	359
xx. 45	351
xxix. 6	497
24	335
26	335
27	335
28	441
29	336
36	364
38	364
39	364
40	343, 352, 359
41	343, 352, 359
	364
xxxiv. 25	411

LEVITICUS

i. 4	331
ii. 1	343, 350, 352, 359
2	359
3	351
4	343, 350, 352, 359
5	343

LEVITICUS

	PAGE
ii. 6	352
7	343, 350, 352
11	343, 359
13	343, 352, 359
15	352
iii. 2, 8, 13	331
iv. 4, 15	331
20	331, 364
24, 26, 29, 31, 35	331
v. 5	332
11	343, 352, 395
vi. 22	364
25	351
vii. 11-14	336
30, 32, 34	336
ix. 7, 16, 22	364
x. 14, 15	335, 336
xiv. 30	364
xvi. 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 13,	
14, 15, 16, 17,	
20-22, 24, 27	469
4, 9	364
11	373
21, 22	332
xxi. 22	351
xxiii. 12	364
13-18	359

NUMBERS

v. 15	352
ix. 2	364
xi. 29	528
xii. 9	558
xv. 3-11, 24	335
19-21	359
xviii. 8-12, 24	336
xxiv. 28	335
xxviii. 10	359
12-15, 31	352
xxix. 30, 31, 39	352

NUMBERS

	PAGE
xxxi. 26, 29, 41	335
29, 41	335

DEUTERONOMY

xvi. 1	364
xviii. 15	523

JOSHUA

v. 13	558
vi. 5	558
9	364

JUDGES

vi. 21	558
vii. 13	20

1 KINGS

viii. 61	364
xviii. 25, 26	364
29	364
xix. 16	69
xxv. 11	411

2 KINGS

iv. 42	20
vi. 13	411
x. 21, 24, 25	364
xxiii. 21	364

2 CHRONICLES

vii. 4	411
xxx. 1, 2	364
xxxv. 1	364
17	364

EZRA

vi. 19	364
------------------	-----

604 INDEX OF TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE REFERRED TO,

PSALMS		PAGE
xxi. 24.	.	121
xxvi. 6.	.	412
li. 10.	.	351
17.	.	342
lxxvi. 15.	.	364
lxxxviii. 15.	.	412
civ. 15.	.	331
cv. 16.	.	331
cxli. 2.	349, 411,	472
cxlviii. 5.	.	363

PROVERBS		PAGE
ix. 2.	.	411
xvii. 1.	.	411

ISAIAH		PAGE
i. 22.	.	37
iii. 1.	.	331
liii. 10.	.	342
12.	.	99
lvii. 15.	.	351
lxvi. 3.	.	476

JEREMIAH		PAGE
xxx. 34.	.	351

EZEKIEL		PAGE
iv. 42.	.	411
xviii. 4.	.	331
xlvi. 25.	.	411

DANIEL		PAGE
iii. 25.	.	558

AMOS		PAGE
v. 22.	.	352

ZECHARIAH		PAGE
xiii. 1.	.	523

MALACHI		PAGE
i. 11.	.	348

ST. MATTHEW		PAGE
v. 23.	.	326
vi. 23, 24.	.	355
xii. 40.	.	379
xiii. 6.	.	552
xv. 3.	.	586
10.	.	75
xxii. 31, 32, 45.	74, 75	
xxvi. 20-30.	.	512
26.	3, 17	
26-29.	.	93
27.	.	40
xxvii. 50.	.	343

ST. MATTHEW		PAGE
xxvii. 51.	.	552
xxviii. 1.	.	551
2.	.	552
7.	.	512
9, 20.	.	13
20.	.	15

ST. MARK		PAGE
iii. 20.	.	586
iv. 6.	.	552
vii. 2.	.	2
2, 5.	.	586
xiv. 1-3.	.	589
17.	.	589
22-25.	.	93
xv. 39.	.	591
xvi. 1, 2, 4.	.	552
7, 14.	.	512
14.	.	74

ST. LUKE		PAGE
i. 2.	.	75
20.	.	558
iv. 13.	.	558
vi. 30.	.	558
x. 6.	.	512
xii. 57.	.	74
xv. 20.	.	551
xxii. 10, 13.	.	511
19.	.	17
19, 20.	.	93
20.	.	114
22-37.	.	589
22-26.	.	114
xxiii. 45.	.	552
46.	.	360
xxiv. 2, 6.	.	552
16, 31.	.	559
30.	.	585
31.	.	557
39.	74, 554	
43.	.	74
52.	.	512

ST. JOHN		PAGE
i. 18.	.	558
33.	.	15
iii. 23, 26.	.	13
24, 26.	.	524
iv. 1, 2.	.	13
2.	.	512
23, 24.	.	13
v. 13.	.	558
vi. 9, 13.	.	30
17.	.	552
32-63.	135, 521	
44, 45.	.	115
53.	.	106
53, 57.	.	311

ST. JOHN		PAGE
vi. 53-58.	.	299
57.	.	306
54, 56, 53.	.	270
63.	.	85
viii. 59.	.	559
x. 15.	.	342
18.	.	360
37, 38.	.	76
39.	.	559
xii. 27.	.	360
xiii. 2.	.	360
36.	512, 559	
xiv. 1.	.	75
17.	.	431
21, 22.	.	553
23.	.	431
xvi. 28.	.	13
33.	.	412
xvii. 5.	.	512
5.	.	321
19.	.	360
xviii. 1.	.	360
xix. 30.	.	343
xx.	.	512
xx. 1.	.	552
2, 18.	.	512
19.	512, 555	
20.	467, 554	
21.	.	513
26.	.	554
27.	.	554

ACTS		PAGE
i. 2.	.	75
13.	511, 513	
ii. 24.	.	307
32.	.	75
42.	.	1
44, 45.	.	492
46.	2, 511	
iii. 15.	.	75
21.	.	13
26.	.	75
31.	.	321
iv. 20.	74, 75	
32-35.	.	479
33.	.	75
34, 35.	.	492
v. 29, 32.	.	75
31.	.	75
vi. 1, 2.	.	492
vii. 11.	.	331
x. 3.	.	74
39-43.	.	75
47, 48.	.	525
xii. 10.	.	554
xiii. 30, 31.	.	74
xx. 7.	3, 492	
xxiii. 15, 22.	.	553
xxiv. 1.	.	553

INDEX.

ACC

- A**CCIDENTS, see Substance
 — and substance inseparable, 66
 — or properties demonstrate the substance, 65
 — and substance, separation of, is not attempted to be proved by Aquinas, 67
 — — — deduced by Aquinas from transubstantiation, 67
 — — — how is their alleged separation to be shown, 68
 Adoration of our Lord in the holy Communion taught by Divines of the Church of England, 288
 — Eucharistical, depends on the question of "The Real Presence," 277
 — — — Mr. Keble's work on, 277
 — — — Archdeacon Wilberforce's doctrine of, 277
 "Altar, if thou bring thy gift to the," 355
 — The precept of immediate application to the Jews, and afterwards to Christians, 357
 — as is the dispensation, so is the, 357
 — of the Gospel, for spiritual sacrifices, 357
 — in Mat. vi. 23, 24 does not mean or prove a material altar, 357
 "— we have an," Heb. xiii., 395
 — does not prove a material sacrifice, 396
 Altars, &c., early Christians charged with the want of, 411
 — we have; antitypes to the Jewish type, 497
 Ambrose, his teaching, 145
 — on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 429, 433, 438
 — his testimony alleged by Mr. Keble for "Eucharistical Adoration," 282
 Ἀνάμνησις, Malan on, 575
 Andrewes, Bishop, says we must go *ad cadaver*, 103, *n*
 — — — 180
 — — — on the feast in the Eucharist, 317
 Anticipation of the glorified body of our Lord, 120
 Apost. Constitutions, their teaching, 146
 Aquarii, or Hydroparastata, used water, 27

BED

- Aquinas, the same thing may be called by many different names, 1 *n*
 — his discussion about the use of other things than bread and wine in the Eucharist, 18
 — disallows the use of anything but bread and wine in the Eucharist, 18
 — deduces the separation of substance and accidents from transubstantiation, 67
 — on conversion of substance, 80
 — definition of sacrifice, 333
 — did not teach the continuous sacrifice in heaven, 449
 Articles, the thirty-nine, 239
 — changes in, do not affect the question, 241
 — reject transubstantiation, 244
 — real presence not taught in, 245
 Artotyritæ, or Artoturitæ, used cheese in the Eucharist, 18
 Athanasius, his teaching, 144
 — on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 434, 438
 Attributes of our Lord prove his Divine majesty, 66
 Augsburg Confession, definition of Sacrament, 9 *n*
 Augustine in Ps. lxxiii. Cont. Faust. XIX. xiv. the Sacraments of the New Law give what those of the Old promised, 12 *n*.
 — his teaching, 146, 156
 — definitions of sacrifice, 333
 — res and virtus sacramenti, 230
 — on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 426, 430, 438
 — his testimony alleged by Mr. Keble for "Eucharistical Adoration," 283
 — on benefit of receiving, 568
 — on ubiquity, 569
- B**APTISM by the disciples, baptism by Jesus, 523
 Basil, his teaching, 145
 Bede, his teaching, 157

BEL

- Bellarmino, on omission in Hebrews of mention of a sacrifice of Melchisedeck, 382
- did not teach the continuous sacrifice in heaven, 449; taught the continuous sacrifice on earth, 452, 458
- Bellarmino's argument for transubstantiation, from the creation of light before the sun, 64
- admission that the senses cannot be deceived about their proper object, 71
 - attempt to prove that Melchisedeck offered the bread and wine, 367
 - definition of sacrifice, 334
 - — — compared with the Trent definition, 337
 - — — its variance from the doctrine of the Church of Rome, 318
 - overturns the sacrifice of the cross, 338
- Berengarius, his two recantations: but neither of them asserted a conversion of the substance of the bread into Christ's flesh, 63
- Beveridge, 209
- Bickersteth's objections to doctrine of a feast on a sacrifice, 310
- Bilson, 171
- Body of our Lord external to the elements at the institution, 113
- broken, blood shed, given by our Lord, 130
 - and blood of Christ, given by Him apart, 361
 - — — acknowledged to have been so given, by Cat. Con. Trent; Bellarmine, Jolly, Patrick, Bull, and Aquinas: and that it was the dead body, 361 *n*
 - — — the inward and spiritual grace of the Eucharist, 232
 - — — are not, and cannot be present, 132
 - — — in what sense the bread and wine were understood in the ancient Liturgies to be, 436
 - — — supposed by some to depart from the elements, 72
- "Body" not understood by compilers of our Prayer Book as synonymous with "blood," 234
- glorified, of our Lord held to be present in the Roman, Lutheran, and nineteenth century doctrines, 95
 - and blood, the, not whole Christ, 600
- Bramhall, 191
- Bread, what kind to be used, 18
- of wheat flour only to be used, 19
 - how it is to be made, 19
 - whether necessary that it should be unleavened, 19
 - not necessary that it should be unleavened, 20
 - whether leavened or not, determined by the oblations of the people, 21

CAL

- Bread, whether leavened or not, use of indifferent, 23
- the size of, 25
 - the shape of, 25
 - shape of the, in the Church of Rome, 25
 - — — as directed in Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, 25
 - use of wafer, a Romish practice, not earlier than the eleventh or twelfth century, 25
 - leavened or unleavened, is still bread, 22
 - leavened, used by the Eastern Church, 21
 - — — use of, allowed to be valid by Church of Rome, 21
 - unleavened, used by our Lord, 19
 - — — used by Church of Rome, and required by her, 21
 - — — mystic plea for, 22
 - the Rubric respecting the, 25
 - unleavened, not usual to be eaten in the province of Canterbury, 24
 - the best and purest wheat, required by Church of England, 23
 - the, consecrated, still bread, but the body of Christ, 273
- Bread and wine, used by our Lord in the institution, 17
- — — only to be used by us, 17
 - — — ever allowed in the Church, 17
 - — — the Sacrament not to be celebrated without both, 29
 - — — one not to be consecrated or ministered without the other, 29
 - — — objections from the want of, 30
 - — — in the Paschal Supper, and in the institution, neither oblation nor sacrifice, 485, 486
 - — — of the Eucharist are not a mincha, 352
 - — — the, taken by the Fathers for that which Christ called them, 256
 - — — the elements acknowledged by the Church of Rome, to be still called, 550
 - — — the, are and are not, the body and blood of Christ, 269
 - — — our Lord did not call each or either his body and blood, but He called each by a distinct name, the one his body, the other his blood, 302
- Breaking of bread one of the names of the Eucharist, 1
- Brett, 217
- Bull, 211
- CALVIN'S sacrifice, Archdeacon Freeman on, 594
- — — why not accepted, 372
- Calvin's definition of Sacrament, 9 *n*
- argument for use of other liquids than wine, 27

CAN

- Canon of the Mass, 571
 Carter, Mr., correspondence with Mr. Marriott, 90
 — — examination of his arguments for "continuous sacrifice," 466
 Catechism of the Church of England teaches the true doctrine as to the proper elements, 29
 — of Trent on the name of Lord's Supper, 3 *n*
 — of Church of England, 229
 — definition of Sacraments in, 281
 Cheese used by heretics in the Eucharist, 18
 Christ, our Lord, to be adored everywhere, 278
 — offered no sacrifice but of Himself, 595
 Chrysostom, his teaching, 126, 157
 — enumeration of sacrifices, 411
 — does not include the elements, 413
 — on the "continuous sacrifice," 593
 — on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 425, 438
 Church, Mr., on *τύπος*—objection to his note, 152
 — of Sion on site of the "Large Upper Room," 513
 — practice of; no sacrifice of the elements in, 414
 — of England, her teaching, 229
 — — that she does not expressly deny, does not warrant imputing to her, the doctrine of the Real Presence, 254
 — — her teaching, 255
 Clement of Alexandria, his teaching, 141
 — — and others understood the dead body, 108
 Cenaculum, 513
 Comber, 212
 Commemoration, a name of the Eucharist, 5
 Communion of the body and blood of Christ, a name of the Eucharist, 4
 — in both kinds ministered by our Lord, and to be ministered in the Church, 200
 — in one kind, 292
 — — — denunciation of by Popes Leo and Gelasius, 295 *n*
 — — — mainly caused by transubstantiation, 297
 — — — an innovation of modern times, 294
 — — — brief history of the practice, 294
 — — — the practice of the Manichæans, 295
 — — — an exception to universal custom, 295
 — Service of the Church of England, 235
 Consecration of the elements, 43
 — how performed by Christ, 43
 — the words and acts of Christ, the proper form of, 43
 — we are to perform it by following Christ's example, 44

CUP

- Consecration, how St. Paul understood it was to be done, 44
 — delivered by other apostles as they had received it, 45
 — wrongly supposed by the Lord's Prayer only, 45
 — form of, together with the Lord's Prayer, 45
 — required thanksgiving, 45
 — necessity of some form of: our Lord's the only right form, 46
 — forms and prayers properly to be added, 46
 — different opinions on the form of, 46
 — makes the elements that which our Lord called them, 47
 — effects of, 48
 — rationalistic notions as to its effects, 48
 — the change in, ascribed to the Holy Spirit, 48
 Consubstantiation, first use of the term, 566
 — the name repudiated, and the doctrine apparently denied by Gerhard, 565
 — the name disapproved of by Dr. Pusey, 54
 — the doctrine of Luther, 87
 — Luther's doctrine rightly called, 54
 — affirms impossibility of transubstantiation, 549
 "Continuous sacrifice," doctrine of, examined, 463
 — — in heaven, 448
 — — not held by Aquinas or Bellarmine, 449
 — — citations in reference to it from Aquinas, 422; Bellarmine, 449, 452; Field, Jeremy Taylor, 452; Cosin, Jolly, 453; Phillpotts, Manning, 456; Wilberforce, 457, 460; Harding, 459; memorial to Archbishop Longley, 460; Shipley, 461
 — — Chrysostom on, 593
 Corporal Presence, 248
 Cosin, 193
 — citation from, on the "continuous sacrifice," 453
 Council of Nice, its teaching, 144
 Cranmer on the meaning of Sacrament, 9 *n*
 Cudworth, observations on his doctrine, and the opposition made to it, 312
 Cup, denial of it to all but the officiating priest, 293
 — non-ministration of, examples alleged, 293 *n*
 — concession of the, 297
 — withdrawn and left to the discretion of the Pope, 298
 — denial of, alleged grounds for, 298
 — — indefensible, 302
 — mixed, origin of from the Agape, 35

CUP

- Cup, mixed, no objection to on general grounds, if with very little water, 38
 — — use of, said to be after our Lord's example, 36
 — — not always used by the Jews, 36
 — — when used by the Jews, was for sobriety, 37
 — — no indication of it in the institution of the Eucharist, 37
 — — probable origin of, in prevention of abuse, 38
 — — among the Jews, had much water, 38
 — — or not, to be determined by the Church, 38
 — — the general rule throughout Christendom, 38
 — — Bishop Andrewes on, 40
 — — not to be in services of the Church of England, 40
 — — symbolism of, lost by mixing in the vestry, 41
 — — before services inconsistent with intention of the Church of England, 41
 — — observations by L'Arroque, 532
 — — mystical significations, 533
 — — opinions of P. Lombard, Bishop Fell, and the Roman Church, 535
 — — reasons assigned for, by the Council of Trent, 539
 — — allowed in Second Book of Edward VI., 38
 — — not now required, 39
 — — held by Church of Rome not to pertain to the essence of the Sacrament, 539
 Cyprian, his teaching, 143, 157
 — — on Melchisedek, 369
 — — on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 436, 438
 — — on oblations, 481
 Cyril of Alexandria, his teaching, 146
 — — notion of God sending a power of life into the elements, his notion rationalistic, 49
 — — on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 425, 438
 — — of Jerusalem, on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 432, 434
 — — on oblations, 483
 — — his teaching, 145
 — — special notice of it, 151
 — — his testimony alleged by Mr. Keble for "Eucharistical Adoration," 280

DAMNATION, in eating and drinking unworthily, 275

Dead body of Christ, understood by the Fathers and English Divines, 107

Decision of the Court of Arches examined and shown to be wrong, 23

Denison, Archdeacon, his opinion that in John vi. our Lord is to be understood not only of the gift in the Eucharist, but of its benefits, 272

EXH

- Dionysius Alexandrinus, his teaching, 143
 Disciples made by our Lord with baptism, 524
 Divines, English, none of them teach the "Real Objective Presence," 206
 Doctrines, defective, on Eucharist; opinions of Socinus and Limborch, 541
 Donne, 181

ECCLESIASTIC and Theologian, *v n.* 4 *n.*

- Ed. VI., First Book of, no authority for us now, 39
 Elements, the, substance of, held to remain by Dr. Pusey, Archdeacon Wilberforce, &c., 54
 — — acknowledged by the Church of Rome to be still called bread and wine, 550
 — — proved to be bread and wine as well after as before consecration, 69
 — — "Real Objective Presence" said to be in or under the, 55
 Emmaus, breaking of bread at, 585
 — — the transactions at, no proof for communion in one kind, 301
 Ephrem Syrus, his teaching, 153
 — — on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 428, 438
 Epiphanius, his teaching, 156
 — — on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 431
 Eucharist, a name of this holy rite, 5
 — — the, feast in, not literal or material, 318
 — — a feast on a sacrifice, not a novelty, 312
 — — a feast, and what the subject of the feast is, 309, 311
 — — a communion and a sacrifice, 305
 — — a feast upon a sacrifice, 305
 — — what it was at the first celebration, 116
 — — the same now as at first, 117
 — — Augustine's and Chrysostom's opinion, 129
 — — partaking of by the faithful, 527
 — — connection of John vi. 32-63 with the institution of, 525
 — — defective doctrines of, 540
 Eucharistical adoration, testimonies for it alleged by Mr. Keble from Cyril of Jerusalem, 280; Ambrose, 282; Augustine, 283; Theodoret, 285
 — — not taught or practised by the Church of England, 286
 — — not to be found in the "Black Rubric," 287
 Eucharistic sacrifice according to Roman doctrine, 445 and *n.*
 — — the true, 474
 Euchitæ were for prayer without sacraments, 12 *n.*
 Eusebius of Cæsarea, his teaching, 144
 Exhortations in our Liturgy, 235

FAI

FAITH and sense, each has its province, 28

- alone, could ever, from the first, make men partakers of the body and blood of Christ; but that faith works in connection with his ordinance, 261
- and the Sacrament, both means, each in its kind, 262

Fathers, ancient, their teaching on the Eucharist, 140

- the, agree with the literal interpretation, 105
- held that the bread is the body and the wine the blood of Christ; but not that the elements contained them, 161
- none of them teach the "Real Objective Presence," 256
- the, what their evidence proves, 148
- no sufficient proof that they regarded the bread and wine of Melchisedek as a sacrifice, 394

Feast on a sacrifice, objections against the doctrine that the Eucharist is, by Bickersteth, 310; by Hickeys and by Johnson, 314; by Mosheim, 317; by the Tracts for the Times, 319; the objections apply not to the doctrine, but to a misapprehension of it, 321

- in the Eucharist, spiritual, 320

Fell, 201

Field on the Church, citation from, on the "continuous sacrifice," 454

Firmilian, his teaching, 143

Flesh and blood of Christ understood by the Fathers of the dead body, 106

Forbes, 189

Freeman, Archdeacon, on the mystery of the Eucharist, 577

- — sacrifice of Cain, 594

Fuller gift, notion of, without authority of Scripture, 123

GAUDENTIUS on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 427, 438

Gelasius on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 433

Gerhard, local inclusion, 160

Geste, 245

Gifts, alms and offerings for the Church, 4

- offered at the celebration of the Eucharist, 4
- the elements taken out of, 4
- grace, or inward part of the Sacrament, offered to, but not received by all, 269

Glorified body, our Lord's, supposed in transubstantiation, 82

- — — neither given nor promised, 133
- — — our Lord said nothing of his, 104, 130
- — — its capabilities beside the question, 104

Gregory of Nazianzum, his teaching, 145

- Nysseu on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 430, 438

JOH

Grabe, 220

Gurney on the manner in which the Church of England speaks of the Eucharist, 527

HACKETT, 208

- Hamilton, Bishop, on *ποιεῖτε*, 364

Hammond, 200

Herbert, 190

Hickeys, 211

- objections to feast on a sacrifice, 314

Hilary, 243

Hippolytus, his teaching, 142

Holy Spirit, the, the res Sacramenti of Johnson's theory, 422

- — prayer that God would send his, down on the gifts, 50
- — effect of his descent on the elements disputed, 50

Homily of worthily receiving the Sacrament, 5

Homilies: "no untrue figure of a thing absent;" opinions of Cranmer, Jewel, Hooker, and Augustine, 517

- teaching of, 7, 252

Honey and water, or mead, suggested by Melancthon, 27

Hooker, an alleged instance of his over-explaining, 290

- did not hold the Real Presence, 175
- extract from on use of appointed means, 526

"House to house, from," Acts ii. 46, 511

Hydroparastatæ or Aquarii used water, 27

Humble access, prayer of, 236

IGNATIUS, his teaching, 141

- Incense, signifies prayer, 349

Institution of Eucharist, account of, 93

- words of the, do not prove a material sacrifice, 358

Interpretations, Roman, Lutheran, and Tractarian, reduced to form of our Lord's words, 96

- compared with our Lord's words, 97
- mutilate our Lord's words, 99
- all, in reality, take only the words, "This is My body," 99
- virtually and necessarily imply a denial of our Lord's words, 100

Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Liturgies, 435

"Inward" misinterpreted for "in," 233

Irenæus, his teaching, 141

Irregularities in ministration of the Eucharist, 294

JACKSON, 182

- Jerome, his teaching, 146

John, St., his sixth chapter; controversy about it to little purpose, 135

JOH

- John, St., his sixth chapter; connection of it with the Eucharist, 135
- Johnson, 213
- objections to feast on a sacrifice, 314
- his shocking words on the sacrifice of the Cross, 316
- definition of sacrifice, 340
- attempt to prove a sacrifice of the elements from the accounts of the institution, 359
- notion of our Lord's having offered Himself in the institution of the Eucharist, 360
- on omission in Hebrews of a sacrifice of Melchisedek, 377
- evidence for union of the Holy Spirit with the elements: Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, 425; Augustine, 426; Gaudentius, 427; Ephrem Syrus, 428; Ambrose, 429; Gregory Nyssen, 430; Optatus, Epiphanius, 431; Cyril of Jerusalem, 432, 434; Julius Firmicus, Gelasius, 433; Athanasius, Cyprian, Origen, 434; Liturgies, 435
- what his doctrine really amounts to, 437
- Jolly, citation from, on the "continuous sacrifice," 453
- Josephus on Melchisedek, 369
- Judgment, our right to use our, demonstrated, 76
- Julius Firmicus on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 433, 438
- Justin Martyr, his teaching, 121
- — on oblations, 480

- K**EBLE, Mr., on Eucharistical Adoration, 277
- — takes "The Real Presence" as demonstrated, 279
- — his expression of "The Person of Christ being present by the presence of his body and blood," 289
- Ken, 207
- Kneeling at the communion, 247

- L**AUD, 185
- Leo Magnus, his teaching, 147
- Leslie, 216
- L'Estrange, 204
- Light, its creation before the sun, no instance of the separation of substance and accidents, 64
- Literal interpretation, demand of, 92
- — overlooked by those who demand it, 92
- — proper subject of, 93
- — the true, unaccountably overlooked, 112
- — Roman substitute for, 93
- — Lutheran, 95
- — Tractarian, 95
- — the strict, 110
- — vindicated, 102

MEL

- Liturgies, ancient, no sacrifice of the elements in them, 415
- on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 435, 438
- admitted by Mr. Keble to have no example of Eucharistic adoration, 286
- Liturgy of the Church of England, 235
- Local inclusion, 160
- Lombard, Peter, on the Sacraments, 518
- Longley, Archbishop, memorial to, 90
- Lord, our, his resurrection, 551; his entering the room, the doors being shut, 554; his vanishing out of sight, 558
- Lord's Supper, a name of the Eucharist, 3
- — name of, adopted by the Church of England, v 4
- — name of, objected to by Dens, 4
- — Thorndike's opinion that it comprehended the love feast and the Sacrament, 3
- Luther's doctrine as described by himself, 53

- M**ACARIUS, his teaching, 145
- Magnes, his teaching, 143
- Malan on *ἀνάμνησις*, 575
- Marriott's, Mr., correspondence with Mr. Carter, 90
- Mass, the Roman name for the Eucharist, 6 *n*
- Bishop Morton on this name, 6 *n*
- Material sacrifice, four theories of: Mede's, 322; Johnson's, 323; the Tractarians', 325; the Roman, 527
- Mede, 190
- definition of sacrifice, 339
- opinion of oblation of the bread and wine in the Passover, and of an oblation of them in the Eucharist, 358
- Melancthon, suggested honey and water for wine, 27
- Melchisedek, line of argument necessary to prove an offering by him of the bread and wine, 365, 370
- that he offered the bread and wine, at best only probable, 367, 371
- Bellarmine's attempt to prove that he offered the bread and wine, 367
- no proof that he offered sacrifice on meeting Abraham, 395
- Cyprian on, 369
- Josephus on, 369
- Æcumenius on, 375 *n*
- Philo on, 369
- Melchisedek's priesthood, Archdeacon Wilberforce on, 374
- offering, Epistle to Hebrews says nothing of it, 375
- — supposed, Outram on, 375
- alleged sacrifice, opinion of the Fathers for: Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian, 385; Eusebius of Cæsarea, 386; Ambrose, 387; Jerome, Augustine, 388;

MEM

- Chrysostom, Theodoret, Arnobius jun., Cassiodorus, Primasius, 389; Johannes of Damascus, Œcumenius, 390; Theophylact, 391; analysis of their statements, 393, 394
- Memorial, a name of the Eucharist, 5
— to Archbishop Longley, 90
- Mincha and Incense, Mal. iv. 11, must be both literal or both spiritual, 349
— was not bread and wine, 352
- Miracles, the, alleged by teachers of the Real Presence, in our Lord's departure from the tomb, &c., not proved by Scripture, but might be believed, if they had been intimated, 559; but they would not prove that our Lord's body could be in many places at the same time, 561
- Moberley's. Bishop, notion of a fuller gift now, 107
- Montagu, 170, 225
- Morton, 178
- Mosheim's objections to feast on a sacrifice, 317
- Mystery of the Eucharist, Archdeacon Freeman on, 577
- O**BLATION, a name of the Eucharist, 4
— Justin Martyr on, 480, 482; Tertullian, Cyprian, 481; Cyril of Jerusalem, 483
— references on, to Clement of Rome, 492; Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, 493
— of ourselves, 4
— provisions for, in the Church of England, 488
— virtual, Palmer on, 495
- Œcumenius on Melchisedek, 375 n
- Offering of Himself, our Lord's, not actually made but on the cross, 360, 362
— of Christ, made by Himself alone, impossible to be made by any other, 307
— "pure;" material offerings alike pure under the law and the Gospel, 350
— — not a material offering, but spiritual, 351, 353
— — thought by some of the Fathers to be the elements of the Eucharist; but others of a different opinion: as Tertullian, 353; Eusebius and Jerome, 354
- Omission in rubrics, not authorisation, 39
- Optatus on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 431
- Opus operatum, note on, 528
- Origen, his teaching, 142
— on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 434, 438
- Outram, on supposed sacrifice of Melchisedek, 375 n.
- Overall, 176

PUS

- P**ALMER, 222
— on virtual oblation, 495
- Participation, benefits of, in opinion of Luther, and Church of Rome, 566
- Participles in the words of institution, 103
- Paschasius Radbertus, his doctrine, far short of transubstantiation, 60
— called the Sacrament of the Eucharist both a figure and the truth, 62
- Passover, a name of the Eucharist, 6
- Paul, St., on that which the wicked receive, 272
— — in 1 Cor. xi., meant the dead body, 138
— — his words do not prove the Real Presence, 139
- Phillpotts, 221
— citation from, on the "continuous sacrifice," 456
— on Melchisedek, 369
- Pliny's letter to Trajan, 5
- Possible, some things not, with God, 84
- Power of God, appeal to, for transubstantiation, 84
- Ποιείν does not mean "sacrifice," 364
- Prayer in Post Communion of our Liturgy, 237
- Presence and absence, metaphysical disquisitions about, useless, 133
— first use of the word, 162
— but it was in a different sense from the modern, 163
— of Christ used up to the fourteenth century in the sense promised where two or three are gathered together, 164
— of our Lord's glorified body, supposed in transubstantiation, 82
— there, in order to be received, asserted by Dr. Pusey and Bishop Forbes; but the notion rationalistic, 127
— — of the gift of the Sacrament, not necessary, nor consistent with its very nature, 260
— after an immaterial and spiritual manner, 265
— after, and not after the manner of a body, 249
— — of a body after the manner of a spirit, 249
— of our Lord in his divine nature, a true and real presence, 255
— extract from Hooker on true doctrine of our Lord's, 569
— see Real Presence, a true, opposed to Real Presence, 226
- Priest for ever, our Lord a, by virtue of his one sacrifice, once offered, 465
- Priests, the apostles made, not more by the cup than the paten, 301
— of priests, we have, 499
- Priesthood, spiritual, 499
- Pusey, Dr., doctrine of the Real Presence, 88
— — says it is not our Lord's body "as it is in heaven," which is meant, 237

PUS

- Pusey, Dr., does not attempt to prove the Real Presence from the Articles, 240
 — — his argument on the Articles, 240
 — — on the word "in," 158
 — — argues that they who have received the body and blood of Christ may perish; the argument examined, 271
 — — his summary of the teaching of the Church of England, 251
 — — a strange expression of, examined, 273 *n*

QUAKERS, extract from Barclay on the name, 522

RATIONALISM, suggesting use of other liquids than wine, 27

- opposite extremes of, on the Eucharist, 49
 — first symptom of, about the Eucharist, 49
 — doctrine of the Roman Church, an extreme type of, 50
Real Presence, a term not earlier than the era of the Reformation, 91
 — — the term not used in decree of transubstantiation, nor until after Council of Constance in the fifteenth century, 165
 — — not in the elements at first, and not now, 113
 — — in the Roman, Lutheran, and Tractarian Schemes, held to be of the glorified body of Christ, 56
 — — Dr. Pusey's doctrine of, 88
 — — Archdeacon Wilberforce's, 89
 — — doctrine of, as held by Rome, and compared with doctrine deduced from the literal interpretation, 128
 — — the term, begotten of false doctrine, 165
 — — the term accepted by some English Divines, and how this came, 165, 228
 — — an ambiguous term, its several senses, 165
 — — the sense in which it is used by our Divines: Ridley, 167; observations on his use of the term, 169; Montagu, 170; Bilson, 171; observations on these three Divines, 171
 — — Hooker's opinion, a denial of the Real Objective Presence, 175; Overall, 176; Morton, 178; Andrewes, 180; Donne, 181; Jackson, 182; Sutton, 183; White, 184; Laud, 185; observations on his doctrine, 187; Forbes, 189; Mede, Herbert, 190; Bramhall, 191; Cosin, 193; observations on his doctrine, 197; Sparrow, 199; Hammond, 200; Fell, Thorndike, 201; L'Estrango, 204; Taylor, 205; Ken, 207; Hackett, 208; Beveridge, 209; Bull, Hickes, 211; Comber, 212;

SAC

- Wake, Johnson, 213; Sharp, 215; Leslie, 216; Brett, 217; Wheatley, 218; Wilson, 219; Grabe, 220; Phillpotts, 221; Palmer, 222; observations on opinion imputed to him, 223
Real Presence, the term not so much used by our Divines as supposed, 225, 226
 — — Montagu's doctrine of, 225
 — — the term and the doctrine are unknown to the Church of England, 256
 — — — used by English Divines, first to show that the Church of England looks for as great a gift as Rome; and, secondly, to show that the Sacrament is not a bare sign, 257
 — — — improperly applied, 258
 — — ill consequences of the use of the term by English Divines, 259
Real and Essential Presence, 248
Reformation, English, singular marks of Providence in, 245
Res Sacramenti, different in different schemes or theories of sacrifice, 422
 — — in Johnson's theory, is the Holy Spirit, 422
 — — in the Roman and Tractarian theories, 444
Resurrection of our Lord, synoptical account of, 551
 — many saints, Mat. xxvii. 51-53, 553
Ridley, 167, 227
Rock, Dr., his argument for the denial of the cup from John vi., 298
Roman definition of Sacrament looser than that of the Church of England, 10, 11
Rubrics, 246, 250, 251
 — to be construed in agreement with their intention, 26
 — on oblations, 488

SACRAMENT, a name of the Eucharist, 5
 — definition of, in Augsburg Confession, 9 *n*

- — by Calvin, 9 *n*
 — — by the Church of England, 9
 — name of, improperly embraces several rites, but properly only Baptism and the Eucharist, 9
 — first used by Tertullian of Baptism and the Eucharist, 9
 — use of the word by Cranmer, 9 *n*
 — not to be consecrated without wine, 514
Sacramental oblation abolished in the Church of England, 494
 — "presence:" presence "after the manner of a Sacrament:" the term examined and rejected, 263
Sacraments explained by Peter Lombard, 518
 — name and number, 519
 — quotations from Alexander of Hales, Hugo de St. Victore, &c., 520; Luther, 521

SAC

- Sacraments, opinion of our Church, 521
 — — Roman Church, 521
 — only two, held at first; then three; then five, 420; at length seven, 521
 — two only, allowed by the Church of England, 10
 — the Homily on their number, 10
 — the five reputed, have no promise tied to the visible sign, 10
 — — — personal necessity of, to salvation, denied by the Church of England, 10
 — denied by the Ascodrutæ, 11
 — — Quakers, 11
 — denial of by Quakers, and their arguments, 12
 — mystical meanings of, 537
 — true doctrinal uses of, 538
 — generally necessary to salvation: baptism to all of any age; the Eucharist those of fit age, 16
 Sacramentum, meaning of, 516
 Sacrifice, a name of the Eucharist, 6
 — definitions of by Augustine, 329; Aquinas, 333; Bellarmine, 334; Mede, 339; Johnson, 340; Thorndike, 344; Wilberforce, 345; Medd, 346; Theologian and Ecclesiastic, 346; all these, *petitiones principii*, 347
 — material, passages of Scripture alleged for Mal. i. 11, 348
 — signification of, 331
 — imposition of hands in, 332
 — the ancient Church understood the Eucharist to be, 419
 — alleged, of the Sacramentum and "res Sacramenti," 421
 — material, different theories of, 421
 — Eucharistic, teaching of the Fathers on: Clement of Rome, 399; Ignatius, 400; Justin Martyr, 401; Irenæus, 403; Tertullian, 405; the sum of their testimonies, 406. Negative evidence: Justin Martyr, 406; Barnabas, Athenagoras, 407; Irenæus, Tertullian, 408; Minucius Felix, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, 409
 — the true Eucharistic, 474
 — no, offered by our Lord, but of Himself, 595
 — the, we partake of, not made by us, but by Christ Himself, once for all, upon the Cross, and the Eucharist a proof to us of that sacrifice, 308
 — of Christ, Hebrews viii. 3, 463
 — — opinions of Mr. Carter, 466
 — High Priest typical of Christ, 468
 — Mr. Shipley on the Sacrifice of the High Priest, 471
 — of Christ none could offer but Himself, 475
 — — of continuous power, 307
 — — true doctrine of, 472
 Sacrifices of the law, 306

TAT

- Saravia, and other Divines of the Church of England, understood the dead body, 109
 Sense and faith, each has its province, 78
 Senses and judgment, the exercise of them taught by our Lord, 74
 — — we believe in dependence on them in the Apostles, 75
 — — of the Apostles, our faith founded on, 75
 Senses may be disordered or deceived; but not all the senses of all men everywhere and always, about the same thing, 69
 — the, not deceived, but the judgment may be mistaken, 70
 — the, if deceived after consecration, are deceived before it, 71
 — our, the necessity of trusting to them, by Jeremy Taylor, 76
 Sharp, 215
 Shipley, examination of his arguments for "continuous sacrifice," 471
 Sparrow, 199
 Spiritual sacrifices, the true Eucharistic sacrifice, 476
 — "presence" considered, 264
 — — of a material body, a real absence, 266
 Steeped or dipped Eucharist, 297
 — — — rise of the practice, 302
 — — — in the Liturgies, 303
 — — — necessary cautions now with regard to this practice, 304
 — — — destroys the legitimate symbolism of the Eucharist, 303
 — — — character and nature of the Sacrament changed by it, 303
 Substance of the elements, change of, 57
 — and accidents, not necessary to notice scholastic definitions of, 57
 — division of created things into, said to be exploded, but the division still retained and used, 57
 — — division of things into, used merely to express doctrine of transubstantiation, but not its foundation, 58
 — of elements not allowed to remain by the Church of Rome, 58
 — and accidents, inseparable, 66
 — abstract, metaphysical, we have no idea of, 73
 — separation of, from its accidents; no example of it in human experience, 64
 — proved by its accidents, 65
 — of all material things, material, 72
 — alleged change of, into the body and blood of Christ, 80
 Sutton, 183
 TATIAN, his teaching, 141
 Taylor, Jeremy, 205
 — — on the glories and names of the Eucharist, 7

TAY

- Taylor, Jeremy, on the supposed offering of our Lord by Himself at the institution of the Eucharist, 363
 — — citation from, on the "continuous sacrifice," 452
 Tertullian first called Baptism and the Eucharist by the name of Sacrament, 9 *n*
 — his teaching, 142
 — a special notice of it, 149
 — unanswerable argument on the senses, 37
 — on oblations, 481
 Thanksgiving an indispensable part of the service, 5
 Theodoret on the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament, 425, 438
 — his testimony alleged by Mr. Keble for "Eucharistical adoration," 285
 Thorndike, 201
 — on the definition of sacrifice, 344
 — notion that the Lord's Supper was the love feast and the Eucharist, 3
 Total abstinence societies, 31
 — — — ignore the fact that every Christian is pledged against all sin, 31
 — — — would put down vice by putting down virtue, 32
 — — lecturers boast of their sins and of their giving them up, 31
 Tracts for the Day, 55
 Tracts for the Times, objections to feast on a sacrifice, 319
 Tractarian, Dr. Pusey accepts the name, 56
 Transubstantiation, first use of the word, 51
 — doctrine of, 51
 — further account of in Trent Catechism, 52
 — not thought of for many centuries, 58
 — what it comprises, 63
 — the decree of, 543
 — Archbishop Bramhall's catalogue of questions and debates from, 544
 — remarks of Cranmer on the doctrine, 547; Stanley Faber on, 548
 — denial of, by our Church, 549
 — without transubstantiation, 81
 — useless, 85
 Trent, Council of, against those who deny seven sacraments, 10
 Trevor on the alleged sacrifice of Melchisedek, 597
 Type requires a Divine intimation, 379
 — thought by Johnson sufficiently established by authority of the Fathers, 379
 Types, Van Mildert, Bishop, on, 378 *n*

UBIQUITY, Augustine on, 569

Upper Room, Large, ἀνώγειον, explanation of, 511

ZUI

- VAN MILDERT, Bishop, on types, 378 *n*
 "Verily and indeed" does not prove the presence, 233
 "Virtual presence," of that which is not, impossible, 267
 Viaticum, a Roman name for the Eucharist, 6
 WAKE, 213
 Water, the necessity of, in baptism, 525
 — used instead of wine by some heretics, 27
 Waterland did not hold the "continuous sacrifice" in heaven, 454
 Wheatley, 218
 White, 184
 Whole, Christ, his body and blood not, 600
 Wicked, what received by, 268
 Wilberforce, Archdeacon, his doctrine of the Real Presence, 89
 — — his statements of the doctrine of the Real Presence, 55
 — — his expression of Christ being present because of the presence of his body, 290
 — — notion of a fuller gift now, 118
 — — modification of this notion, 122
 — — on the definition of sacrifice, 345
 — — on Eucharistic sacrifice, 417
 — — examination of his arguments, 418
 — — on Melchisedek's priesthood, 374
 — — on Eucharistical adoration, 277
 Wilson, 219
 Wine, notion that our Lord used without alcohol, unsupported by any proof, 32, 33
 — such as was in common use, employed by our Lord, 33
 — unfermented, not certain to have been used by our Lord, 34
 — — no sufficient reason given that He used it, 35
 — fermented, used at Corinth, 34
 — with water added to it, 35
 — of the fruit of the vine, to be used, 27
 — such as would be used for an ordinary meal, 38
 — and wine only to be used, 28
 — examples of use of other liquids than, from erroneous considerations, 28
 Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, on necessity of receiving the Holy Communion, 530
 — on a perversion of Gelasius, 295 *n*
 — — St. Andrews, on the sacrifice of Christ, 466
 Worship, spiritual, the worship of the whole man, of body as well as soul, 14
 ZUINGLES, and other defective doctrines of Eucharist, 540

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE
BAMPTON LECTURES FOR 1837.

THE PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS AGAINST
THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY, AND A PORTION OF
THE EVIDENCE ON WHICH THAT DOCTRINE IS RECEIVED
BY THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, REVIEWED IN EIGHT SERMONS
PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD IN THE
YEAR 1837, AT THE LECTURE FOUNDED BY THE REV. JOHN
BAMPTON, M.A., CANON OF SALISBURY.

8vo. 12s.

‘These Lectures are recommended as the most complete and satisfactory manual of the evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity,—most convenient for reference, and most valuable, as being popular and intelligible to every one of ordinary understanding, at the same time that the reasoning is so close and cogent as to be worthy the attention of the most acute.’
BRITISH MAGAZINE, October 1837.

‘He who is really fit for the treatment of such a matter must bring with him the qualifications of the philosopher, of the divine, of the scholar, and likewise of the man of sound, practised, and well-balanced judgment, which can assert, firmly and unflinchingly, the tenets of Christian orthodoxy, without being betrayed into statements which are untenable and even fatal.—’

‘Mr. Vogan has not been wanting to the magnitude and difficulty of his task.—’

‘What Mr. Vogan undertook to do he has done well.—’

‘The sound and learned divinity which Mr. Vogan has furnished us from Oxford.’
BRITISH CRITIC, October 1837.

‘In these deeply argumentative Sermons the doctrine of the Trinity is established on grounds which cannot be subverted, and is elucidated with a perspicuity which has seldom been equalled.’
CHURCH OF ENGLAND QUARTERLY REVIEW, July 1837.

‘We think that the Author has executed his purpose with knowledge and judgment; that his reasoning is clear and sound, and his Scriptural texts justly and rightly examined.’
GENTLEMAN’S MAGAZINE, February 1838.

SERMONS.

- I. THE FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.
- II. THE THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.
- III. CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.
- IV. CONVERSION AND REGENERATION.
- V. NAMES WRITTEN IN HEAVEN.

8vo. 6s.

‘Five sound and useful Sermons, apparently as a companion to his Bampton Lectures.’
BRITISH CRITIC, July 1838.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION DEVELOPED AND PROVED.

IN A SERMON PREACHED AT THE VISITATION OF THE LORD
BISHOP OF NORWICH, JULY 4TH, 1838.

‘On the very appropriate text, Heb. v. 4, Mr. Vogan has founded one of the most able arguments in defence of the Apostolic succession that we have hitherto met with. We were prepared by his admirable Bampton Lectures for something exceedingly good on this interesting question; but the closeness of the reasoning, fortified by the whole artillery of Scripture, prove him to be an Apollon, mighty in the Scriptures.’

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER, June 1839.

‘These [Single Sermons] we have fallen in with give a most satisfactory result, as their titles will show; and we name some of them as well for that reason as for their intrinsic excellence. Such are Mr. Vogan’s Sermon, “The Doctrine of the Apostolical Succession Developed and Proved.”’
BRITISH CRITIC, October 1838.

LIGHTS ON THE ALTAR NOT IN USE IN THIS CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

BY AUTHORITY OF PARLIAMENT
IN THE SECOND YEAR OF KING EDWARD THE SIXTH.

THE USE OF THE BURIAL SERVICE AS REQUIRED BY LAW.

2s.

WORKS BY MISS SEWELL.

THOUGHTS for the AGE. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

PASSING THOUGHTS on RELIGION. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

PRINCIPLES of EDUCATION, drawn from Nature and Revelation, and applied to Female Education in the Upper Classes. 2 vols. fcp. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

HISTORY of the EARLY CHURCH, from the First Preaching of the Gospel to the Council of Nicea. Fcp. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

ANCIENT HISTORY of EGYPT, ASSYRIA, and BABYLONIA. On the same plan as 'A First History of Greece,' and 'The Child's First History of Rome,' &c. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

A FIRST HISTORY of GREECE, from the *Siege of Troy*, B.C. 1184, to the *De-struction of Corinth*, B.C. 146. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The CHILD'S FIRST HISTORY of ROME, from the Foundation of Rome, 753, to the Fall of Jerusalem under Titus, A.D. 70. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

JOURNAL KEPT DURING a SUMMER TOUR, for the Children of a Village School; from Ostend to the Lake of Constance, thence to the Simplon, and through part of the Tyrol to Genoa. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

DICTATION EXERCISES: being a New English Spelling-Book founded on the principle, now generally admitted, that ORTHOGRAPHY should be taught by the Eye rather than the Ear. 18mo. price ONE SHILLING.

DICTATION EXERCISES, Second Series; a Correspondence between A. B. and C. D. 18mo. price HALF-A-CROWN.

CONTES FACILES: a Selection of Amusing Stories from Modern French Writers; intended to give Little Girls an interest in reading when they are beginning to understand the language, and to precede *Extraits Choisis*. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CONTES et CRITIQUES FRANÇAIS, Recueillis des Auteurs Modernes. Selected from the Writings of Victor Hugo, E. Saint-Hilaire, Alexandre Dumas, C. Sainte-Beuve, and H. Taine. Crown 8vo. 5s.

EXTRAITS CHOISIS des AUTEURS MODERNES; or, Advanced French Reading-Book for Young Ladies' Schools; comprising pieces of considerable length selected from the best Writers, with a view to sustain the Pupil's interest in each Exercise as a Composition. Crown 8vo. 5s.

NIGHT LESSONS from SCRIPTURE. 32mo. price 3s.

READINGS for EVERY DAY in LENT, compiled from the Writings of Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

SELF - EXAMINATION before CONFIRMATION; with Devotions and Directions for Confirmation Day. 32mo. 1s. 6d.

READINGS for a MONTH PREPARATORY to CONFIRMATION; compiled from the Works of the Writers of the Early and of the English Church. Fcp. 8vo. 4s.

THOUGHTS for the HOLY WEEK for YOUNG PERSONS. Fcp. 8vo. 2s.

PREPARATION for the HOLY COMMUNION; the Devotions compiled chiefly from the works of Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR. 32mo. 3s.

NEW COLLECTIVE EDITION OF MISS SEWELL'S STORIES AND TALES,

EACH COMPLETE IN A SINGLE VOLUME:—

AMY HERBERT, 2s. 6d.

GERTRUDE, 2s. 6d.

The EARL'S DAUGHTER, 2s. 6d.

The EXPERIENCE of LIFE, 2s. 6d.

CLEVE HALL, 3s. 6d.

IVORS, 3s. 6d.

KATHARINE ASHTON, 3s. 6d.

MARGARET PERCIVAL, 5s.

LANETON PARSONAGE, 4s. 6d.

URSULA, 4s. 6d.

A GLIMPSE of the WORLD. Fcp. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The JOURNAL of a HOME LIFE. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.

AFTER LIFE; a Sequel to the 'Journal of a Home Life.' Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**THE ESSAYS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF
A. K. H. B.**

PRESENT-DAY THOUGHTS; Memorials of St. Andrews
Sundays. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

'The teaching is of a religious character, inculcating more especially a careful preparation for the life to come. Alternately reflective and analytical, persuasive and admonitory, the style is impressive in its simple earnestness and eloquence. The figurative language by which the writer seeks to illus-

trate his meaning is well chosen, and some of his ideas are beautifully expressed. In fact the discourses resemble moral and religious essays in many respects rather than sermons, and for this reason lose none of their effect when read.' MORNING POST.

CHANGED ASPECTS of UNCHANGED TRUTHS: Memorials
of St. Andrews Sundays. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

The GRAVER THOUGHTS of a COUNTRY PARSON. FIRST
SERIES. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The GRAVER THOUGHTS of a COUNTRY PARSON. SECOND
SERIES. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

SUNDAY AFTERNOONS at the PARISH CHURCH of a
SCOTTISH UNIVERSITY CITY. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

COUNSEL and COMFORT SPOKEN from a SCOTTISH CITY
PULPIT. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

LEISURE HOURS in TOWN. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The COMMONPLACE PHILOSOPHER in TOWN and
COUNTRY. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The CRITICAL ESSAYS of a COUNTRY PARSON. Crown
8vo. price 3s. 6d.

The AUTUMN HOLIDAYS of a COUNTRY PARSON. Crown
8vo. price 3s. 6d.

The RECREATIONS of a COUNTRY PARSON. FIRST
SERIES. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

The RECREATIONS of a COUNTRY PARSON. SECOND SERIES.
Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

LESSONS of MIDDLE AGE; with Some Account of Various
Cities and Men. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

'This book is full of those clever and bright scintillations of thought which strong minds cast off almost, perhaps altogether, unconsciously—the centrifugal dust of the grindstone when the whirr goes on from impetus in the intervals of real work. *Lessons of Middle Age* is a book of that class to which

Dr. GUTHRIE has contributed so largely—the wholesome and honest-hearted holiday kind of work which is so wonderfully agreeable to read, and from which innumerable lessons of truth and goodness may be learnt without the penalty of an aching brain or the suffocating sense of being sermonised.'

GLOBE.

The PLACE of RITUAL; a Sermon preached at the Re-
opening of Anderston Church, Glasgow, by the Author of 'The Recreations of a Country Parson.' 8vo. price ONE SHILLING.

GENERAL LIST OF WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

Messrs. LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, and DYER.

ARTS, MANUFACTURES, &c.....	12	MISCELLANEOUS WORKS and POPULAR	
ASTRONOMY, METEOROLOGY, POPULAR		METAPHYSICS	6
GEOGRAPHY, &c.	7	NATURAL HISTORY & POPULAR SCIENCE	8
BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS	3	PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.....	20
CHEMISTRY, MEDICINE, SURGERY, and		POETRY and THE DRAMA.....	17
the ALLIED SCIENCES	9	RELIGIOUS and MORAL WORKS	13
CRITICISM, PHILOSOPHY, POLITY, &c....	4	RURAL SPORTS, &c.....	18
FINE ARTS and ILLUSTRATED EDITIONS	11	TRAVELS, VOYAGES, &c.	15
HISTORY, POLITICS, and HISTORICAL		WORKS of FICTION	16
MEMOIRS	1	WORKS of UTILITY and GENERAL	
INDEX	21—24	INFORMATION	19
KNOWLEDGE for the YOUNG	20		

History, Politics, Historical Memoirs, &c.

The History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A.

CABINET EDITION, 12 vols. cr. 8vo. £3 12s.
LIBRARY EDITION, 12 vols. 8vo. £8 18s.

The History of England from the Accession of James II. By Lord MACAULAY.

STUDENT'S EDITION, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12s.
PEOPLE'S EDITION, 4 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.
CABINET EDITION, 8 vols. post 8vo. 48s.
LIBRARY EDITION, 5 vols. 8vo. £4.

Lord Macaulay's Works. Complete and uniform Library Edition. Edited by his Sister, Lady TREVELYAN. 8 vols. 8vo. with Portrait, price £5 5s. cloth, or £8 8s. bound in tree-calf by Rivière.

Varieties of Vice-Regal Life. By Major-General Sir WILLIAM DENISON, K.C.B. late Governor-General of the Australian Colonies, and Governor of Madras. With Two Maps. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

On Parliamentary Government in England: its Origin, Development, and Practical Operation. By ALPHEUS TODD, Librarian of the Legislative Assembly of Canada. 2 vols. 8vo. price £1 17s.

The Constitutional History of England since the Accession of George III. 1760—1860. By Sir THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, K.C.B. Cabinet Edition (the Third), thoroughly revised. 3 vols. crown 8vo. price 18s.

A Historical Account of the Neutrality of Great Britain during the American Civil War. By MOUNTAGUE BERNARD, M.A. Royal 8vo. price 16s.

The History of England, from the Earliest Times to the Year 1865. By C. D. YONGE, Regius Professor of Modern History in Queen's College, Belfast. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Lectures on the History of England, from the Earliest Times to the Death of King Edward II. By WILLIAM LONGMAN. With Maps and Illustrations. 8vo. 15s.

The History of the Life and Times of Edward the Third. By WILLIAM LONGMAN. With 9 Maps, 8 Plates, and 16 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

History of Civilization in England and France, Spain and Scotland. By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. New Edition of the entire work, with a complete INDEX. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 24s.

Realities of Irish Life. By W. STEUART TRENCH, Land Agent in Ireland to the Marquess of Lansdowne, the Marquess of Bath, and Lord Digby. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.

The Student's Manual of the History of Ireland. By M. F. CUSACK, Authoress of 'The Illustrated History of Ireland.' Crown 8vo. price 6s.

A Student's Manual of the History of India, from the Earliest Period to the Present. By Colonel MEADOWS TAYLOR, M.R.A.S. M.R.I.A. Crown 8vo. with Maps, 7s. 6d.

The History of India, from the Earliest Period to the close of Lord Dalhousie's Administration. By JOHN CLARK MARSHMAN. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 22s. 6d.

Indian Polity: a View of the System of Administration in India. By Lieut.-Col. GEORGE CHESNEY. Second Edition, revised, with Map. 8vo. 21s.

Home Politics: being a Consideration of the Causes of the Growth of Trade in relation to Labour, Pauperism, and Emigration. By DANIEL GRANT. 8vo. 7s.

Democracy in America. By ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE. Translated by HENRY REEVE. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

Waterloo Lectures: a Study of the Campaign of 1815. By Colonel CHARLES C. CHESNEY, R.E. late Professor of Military Art and History in the Staff College. Second Edition. 8vo. with Map, 10s. 6d.

The Military Resources of Prussia and France, and Recent Changes in the Art of War. By Lieut.-Col. CHESNEY, R.E. and HENRY REEVE, D.C.L. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Overthrow of the Germanic Confederation by Prussia in 1866. By Sir A. MALET, Bart. K.B.C. late H.B.M. Envoy and Minister at Frankfort. With 5 Maps. 8vo. 18s.

The Oxford Reformers—John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More; being a History of their Fellow-Work. By FREDERIC SEEBOHM. Second Edition. 8vo. 14s.

History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin. By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ, D.D. VOLS. I. and II. 8vo. 28s. VOL. III. 12s. VOL. IV. price 16s. and VOL. V. price 16s.

Chapters from French History; St. Louis, Joan of Arc, Henri IV. with Sketches of the Intermediate Periods. By J. H. GURNEY, M.A. New Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

The History of Greece. By C. THIRLWALL, D.D. Lord Bishop of St. David's. 8 vols. fcp. 28s.

The Tale of the Great Persian War, from the Histories of Herodotus. By GEORGE W. COX, M.A. late Scholar of Trin. Coll. Oxon. Fcp. 3s. 6d.

Greek History from Themistocles to Alexander, in a Series of Lives from Plutarch. Revised and arranged by A. H. CLOUGH. Fcp. with 44 Woodcuts, 6s.

Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece. By WILLIAM MURE, of Caldwell. 5 vols. 8vo. £3 9s.

History of the Literature of Ancient Greece. By Professor K. O. MÜLLER. Translated by LEWIS and DONALDSON. 3 vols. 8vo. 21s.

The History of Rome. By WILHELM IHNE. English Edition, translated and revised by the Author. VOLS. I. and II. 8vo. 30s.

History of the City of Rome from its Foundation to the Sixteenth Century of the Christian Era. By THOMAS H. DYER, LL.D. 8vo. with 2 Maps, 15s.

History of the Romans under the Empire. By Very Rev. CHARLES MERIVALE, D.C.L. Dean of Ely. 8 vols. post 8vo. price 48s.

The Fall of the Roman Republic; a Short History of the Last Century of the Commonwealth. By the same Author. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

Historical and Chronological Encyclopedia; comprising Chronological Notices of all the Great Events of Universal History, including Treaties, Alliances, Wars, Battles, &c.; Incidents in the Lives of Eminent Men, Scientific and Geographical Discoveries, Mechanical Inventions, and Social, Domestic, and Economical Improvements. By the late B. B. WOODWARD, B.A. and W. L. R. CATES. 1 vol. 8vo.

[In the press.]

An Historical View of Literature and Art in Great Britain from the Accession of the House of Hanover to the Reign of Queen Victoria. By J. MURRAY GRAHAM, M.A. 8vo. price 14s.

History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne. By W. E. H. LECKY, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. price 28s.

History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe. By the same Author. Cabinet Edition (the Fourth). 2 vols. crown 8vo. price 16s.

God in History; or, the Progress of Man's Faith in the Moral Order of the World. By the late Baron BUNSEN. Translated from the German by SUSANNA WINKWORTH; with a Preface by Dean STANLEY. 3 vols. 8vo. 42s.

Socrates and the Socratic Schools. Translated from the German of Dr. E. ZELLER, with the Author's approval, by the Rev. OSWALD J. REICHEL, B.C.L. and M.A. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics. Translated from the German of Dr. E. ZELLER, with the Author's approval, by OSWALD J. REICHEL, B.C.L. and M.A. Crown 8vo. 14s.

Saint-Simon and Saint-Simonism; a Chapter in the History of Socialism in France. By ARTHUR J. BOOTH, M.A. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

The History of Philosophy, from Thales to Comte. By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. Fourth Edition, corrected, and partly rewritten. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

The Mythology of the Aryan Nations. By GEORGE W. COX, M.A. late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. price 28s.

The English Reformation. By F. C. MASSINGBERD, M.A. Chancellor of Lincoln. 4th Edition, revised. Fcp. 7s. 6d.

Maunder's Historical Treasury; comprising a General Introductory Outline of Universal History, and a Series of Separate Histories. Fcp. 6s.

Critical and Historical Essays contributed to the *Edinburgh Review* by the Right Hon. Lord MACAULAY:—

STUDENT'S EDITION, crown 8vo. 6s.

PEOPLE'S EDITION, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 8s.

CABINET EDITION, 4 vols. 24s.

LIBRARY EDITION, 3 vols. 8vo. 36s.

History of the Early Church, from the First Preaching of the Gospel to the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325. By the Author of 'Amy Herbert.' New Edition. Fcp. 4s. 6d.

Sketch of the History of the Church of England to the Revolution of 1688. By the Right Rev. T. V. SMORT, D.D. Lord Bishop of St. Asaph. Eighth Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

History of the Christian Church, from the Ascension of Christ to the Conversion of Constantine. By E. BURTON, D.D. late Regius Prof. of Divinity in the University of Oxford. Fcp. 3s. 6d.

Biographical Works.

A Memoir of Daniel Maclise, R.A. By W. JUSTIN O'DRISCOLL, M.R.I.A. Barrister-at-Law. With Portrait and Woodcuts. Post 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

Memoirs of the Marquis of Pomal; with Extracts from his Writings and from Despatches in the State Papers Office. By the CONDE DA CARNOTA. New Edition. 8vo. price 7s.

Reminiscences of Fifty Years. By MARK BOYD. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

The Life of Isambard Kingdom Brunel, Civil Engineer. By ISAMBARD BRUNEL, B.C.L. of Lincoln's Inn, Chancellor of the Diocese of Ely. With Portrait, Plates, and Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

The Life and Letters of the Rev. Sydney Smith. Edited by his Daughter, Lady HOLLAND, and Mrs. ARSTIN. New Edition, complete in One Volume. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

Some Memorials of R. D. Hampden, Bishop of Hereford. Edited by his Daughter, HENRIETTA HAMPDEN. 8vo. with Portrait, price 12s.

The Life and Travels of George Whitefield, M.A. By JAMES PATERSON GLEDSTONE. 8vo. price 14s.

'This pleasantly-written and genial biography of the most extraordinary preacher that England ever produced endeavours, and we think with considerable success, to furnish the answer to a question which at first appears to be almost incapable of any satisfactory solution—What was the secret of his extraordinary power.'
ATHENÆUM.

Memor of Pope Sixtus the Fifth.

By Baron HÜBNER. Translated from the Original in French, with the Author's sanction, by HUBERT E. H. JERNINGHAM. 2 vols. 8vo. [In the press.]

The Life and Letters of Faraday.

By Dr. BENICE JONES, Secretary of the Royal Institution. Second Edition, with Portrait and Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

Faraday as a Discoverer.

By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D. F.R.S. New and Cheaper Edition, with Two Portraits. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

Lives of the Lord Chancellors

and Keepers of the Great Seal of Ireland, from the Earliest Times to the Reign of Queen Victoria. By J. R. O'FLANAGAN, M.R.I.A. Barrister. 2 vols. 8vo. 36s.

Dictionary of General Biography;

containing Concise Memoirs and Notices of the most Eminent Persons of all Countries, from the Earliest Ages to the Present Time. Edited by WILLIAM L. R. CATES. 8vo. price 21s.

Life of the Duke of Wellington.

By the Rev. G. R. GLEIG, M.A. Popular Edition, carefully revised; with copious Additions. Crown 8vo. with Portrait, 5s.

Father Mathew; a Biography.

By JOHN FRANCIS MAGUIRE, M.P. Popular Edition, with Portrait. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

History of my Religious Opinions.

By J. H. NEWMAN, D.D. Being the Substance of Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ. Post 8vo. price 6s.

Letters and Life of Francis

Bacon, including all his Occasional Works. Collected and edited, with a Commentary, by J. SPEDDING. VOLS. I. & II. 8vo. 24s. VOLS. III. & IV. 24s. VOL. V. 12s.

Felix Mendelssohn's Letters from

Italy and Switzerland, and Letters from 1833 to 1847, translated by Lady WALLACE. With Portrait. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 5s. each.

Memoirs of Sir Henry Havelock,

K.C.B. By JOHN CLARK MARSHMAN. People's Edition, with Portrait. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

Essays in Ecclesiastical Biograp-

phy. By the Right Hon. Sir J. STEPHEN, LL.D. Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Vicissitudes of Families.

By Sir J. BERNARD BURKE, C.B. Ulster King of Arms. New Edition, remodelled and enlarged. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 21s.

Lives of the Queens of England.

By AGNES STRICKLAND. Library Edition, newly revised; with Portraits of every Queen, Autographs, and Vignettes. 8 vols. post 8vo. 7s. 6d. each.

Maunder's Biographical Treas-

ury. Thirteenth Edition, reconstructed and partly re-written, with above 1,000 additional Memoirs, by W. L. R. CATES. Fcp. 6s.

*Criticism, Philosophy, Polity, &c.***On Representative Government.**

By JOHN STUART MILL. Third Edition. 8vo. 9s. crown 8vo. 2s.

On Liberty.

By the same Author. Fourth Edition. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d. Crown 8vo. 1s. 4d.

Principles of Political Economy.

By the same. Eighth Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s. or in 1 vol. crown 8vo. 5s.

Utilitarianism.

By the same. 4th Edit. 8vo. 5s.

Dissertations and Discussions.

By the same Author. Second Edition. 3 vols. 8vo. price 36s.

Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's

Philosophy, and of the principal Philosophical Questions discussed in his Writings. By the same. Third Edition. 8vo. 16s.

The Subjection of Women.

By JOHN STUART MILL. New Edition. Post 8vo. 5s.

Inaugural Address delivered to the

University of St. Andrews. By JOHN STUART MILL. 8vo. 5s. Crown 8vo. 1s.

Analysis of the Phenomena of

the Human Mind. By JAMES MILL. A New Edition, with Notes, Illustrative and Critical, by ALEXANDER BAIN, ANDREW FINDLATER, and GEORGE GROTE. Edited, with additional Notes, by JOHN STUART MILL. 2 vols. 8vo. price 28s.

The Elements of Political Eco-

nomy. By HENRY DUNNING MACLEOD, M.A. Barrister-at-Law. 8vo. 16s.

A Dictionary of Political Economy;

Biographical, Bibliographical, Historical, and Practical. By the same Author. VOL. I. royal 8vo. 30s.

Lord Bacon's Works, collected and edited by R. L. ELLIS, M.A. J. SPEDDING, M.A. and D. D. HEATH. New and Cheaper Edition. 7 vols. 8vo. price £3 13s. 6d.

A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive. By JOHN STUART MILL. Seventh Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 25s.

Analysis of Mr. Mill's System of Logic. By W. STEBBING, M.A. New Edition. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

The Institutes of Justinian; with English Introduction, Translation, and Notes. By T. C. SANDARS, M.A. Barrister-at-Law. New Edition. 8vo. 15s.

The Ethics of Aristotle; with Essays and Notes. By SIR A. GRANT, Bart. M.A. LL.D. Second Edition, revised and completed. 2 vols. 8vo. price 28s.

The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle. Newly translated into English. By R. WILLIAMS, B.A. Fellow and late Lecturer Merton College, Oxford. 8vo. 12s.

Bacon's Essays, with Annotations. By R. WHATELY, D.D. late Archbishop of Dublin. Sixth Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Elements of Logic. By R. WHATELY, D.D. late Archbishop of Dublin. New Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d. crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Elements of Rhetoric. By the same Author. New Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

English Synonyms. By E. JANE WHATELY. Edited by Archbishop WHATELY. 5th Edition. Fcp. 3s.

An Outline of the Necessary Laws of Thought: a Treatise on Pure and Applied Logic. By the Most Rev. W. THOMSON, D.D. Archbishop of York. Ninth Thousand. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

The Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal; a Treatise. By THOMAS HARE, Barrister-at-Law. Third Edition, with Additions. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Speeches of the Right Hon. Lord MACAULAY, corrected by Himself. People's Edition, crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Lord Macaulay's Speeches on Parliamentary Reform in 1831 and 1832. 16mo. price ONE SHILLING.

Walker's Pronouncing Dictionary of the English Language. Thoroughly revised Editions, by B. H. SMART. 8vo. 12s. 16mo. 6s.

A Dictionary of the English Language. By R. G. LATHAM, M.A. M.D. F.R.S. Founded on the Dictionary of Dr. S. JOHNSON, as edited by the Rev. H. J. TODD, with numerous Emendations and Additions. 4 vols. 4to. price £7.

Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases, classified and arranged so as to facilitate the expression of Ideas, and assist in Literary Composition. By P. M. ROGET, M.D. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Debater; a Series of Complete Debates, Outlines of Debates, and Questions for Discussion. By F. ROWTON. Fcp. 6s.

Lectures on the Science of Language. By F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A. &c. Foreign Member of the French Institute. Sixth Edition. 2 vols. crown 8vo price 16s.

Chapters on Language. By F. W. FARRAR, M.A. F.R.S. Head Master of Marlborough College. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Southey's Doctor, complete in One Volume, edited by the Rev. J. W. WARTER, B.D. Square crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament; with a New Translation. By M. M. KALISCH, Ph.D. Vol. I. *Genesis*, 8vo. 18s. or adapted for the General Reader, 12s. Vol. II. *Exodus*, 15s. or adapted for the General Reader, 12s. Vol. III. *Leviticus*, Part I. 15s. or adapted for the General Reader, 8s.

A Hebrew Grammar, with Exercises. By the same. Part I. *Outlines with Exercises*, 8vo. 12s. 6d. KEY, 5s. Part II. *Exceptional Forms and Constructions*, 12s. 6d.

Manual of English Literature, Historical and Critical: with a Chapter on English Metres. By THOMAS ARNOLD, M.A. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A Latin-English Dictionary. By JOHN T. WHITE, D.D. Oxon. and J. E. RIDDLE, M.A. Oxon. Third Edition, revised. 2 vols. 4to. pp. 2,128, price 42s.

White's College Latin-English Dictionary (Intermediate Size), abridged from the Parent Work for the use of University Students. Medium 8vo. pp. 1,048, price 18s

White's Junior Student's Complete Latin-English and English-Latin Dictionary. Revised Edition. Square 12mo. pp. 1,058, price 12s.

Separately { ENGLISH-LATIN, 5s. 6d.
{ LATIN-ENGLISH, 7s. 6d.

An English-Greek Lexicon, containing all the Greek Words used by Writers of good authority. By C. D. YONGE, B.A. New Edition. 4to. 21s.

Mr. Yonge's New Lexicon, English and Greek, abridged from his larger work (as above). Square 12mo. 8s. 6d.

The Mastery of Languages; or, the Art of Speaking Foreign Tongues Idiomatically. By THOMAS PRENDERGAST, late of the Civil Service at Madras. Second Edition. 8vo. 6s.

A Greek-English Lexicon. Compiled by H. G. LIDDELL, D.D. Dean of Christ Church, and R. SCOTT, D.D. Dean of Rochester. Sixth Edition. Crown 4to. price 36s.

A Lexicon, Greek and English, abridged for Schools from LIDDELL and SCOTT'S *Greek-English Lexicon*. Twelfth Edition. Square 12mo. 7s. 6d.

A Practical Dictionary of the French and English Languages. By Professor LÉON CONTANSEAU, many years French Examiner for Military and Civil Appointments, &c. New Edition, carefully revised. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Contanseau's Pocket Dictionary, French and English, abridged from the Practical Dictionary, by the Author. New Edition. 18mo. price 3s. 6d.

A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. The Sanskrit words printed both in the original Devanagari and in Roman letters; with References to the Best Editions of Sanskrit Authors, and with Etymologies and comparisons of Cognate Words chiefly in Greek, Latin, Gothic, and Anglo-Saxon. Compiled by T. BENFEY. 8vo. 52s. 6d.

New Practical Dictionary of the German Language; German-English, and English-German. By the Rev. W. L. BLACKLEY, M.A. and Dr. CARL MARTIN FRIEDLÄNDER. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Miscellaneous Works and Popular Metaphysics.

The Essays and Contributions of A. K. H. B. Uniform Editions:—

Recreations of a Country Parson. FIRST and SECOND SERIES, 3s. 6d. each.

The Commonplace Philosopher in Town and Country. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Leisure Hours in Town; Essays Consolatory, Æsthetical, Moral, Social, and Domestic. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The Autumn Holidays of a Country Parson. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The Graver Thoughts of a Country Parson. FIRST and SECOND SERIES, crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

Critical Essays of a Country Parson, selected from Essays contributed to *Fraser's Magazine*. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Sunday Afternoons at the Parish Church of a Scottish University City. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Lessons of Middle Age, with some Account of various Cities and Men. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Counsel and Comfort Spoken from a City Pulpit. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Changed Aspects of Unchanged Truths; Memorials of St. Andrews Sundays. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Present-Day Thoughts; Memorials of St. Andrews Sundays. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Short Studies on Great Subjects.

By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Third Edition. 8vo. 12s. SECOND SERIES, 8vo. 12s.

Lord Macaulay's Miscellaneous Writings:—

LIBRARY EDITION, 2 vols. 8vo. Portrait, 21s.
PEOPLE'S EDITION, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Lord Macaulay's Miscellaneous Writings and Speeches. Student's Edition, in One Volume, crown 8vo. price 6s.

The Rev. Sydney Smith's Miscellaneous Works, including Peter Plymley's Letters, Articles contributed to the *Edinburgh Review*, Letters to Archdeacon Singleton, and other Miscellaneous Writings. 1 vol. crown 8vo. 6s.

The Wit and Wisdom of the Rev. SYDNEY SMITH; a Selection of the most memorable Passages in his Writings and Conversation. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The Eclipse of Faith; or, a Visit to a Religious Septic. By HENRY ROGERS. Twelfth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

Defence of the Eclipse of Faith, by its Author. Third Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Selections from the Correspondence of R. E. H. Greyson. By the same Author. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Families of Speech, Four Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain. By the Rev. F. W. FARRAR, M.A. F.R.S. Post 8vo. with 2 Maps, 5s. 6d.

Chips from a German Workshop; being Essays on the Science of Religion, and on Mythology, Traditions, and Customs. By F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A. &c. Foreign Member of the French Institute. 3 vols. 8vo. £2.

An Introduction to Mental Philosophy, on the Inductive Method. By J. D. MORELL, M.A. LL.D. 8vo. 12s.

Elements of Psychology, containing the Analysis of the Intellectual Powers. By the same Author. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Secret of Hegel: being the Hegelian System in Origin, Principle, Form, and Matter. By JAMES HUTCHISON STIRLING. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

Sir William Hamilton; being the Philosophy of Perception: an Analysis. By the same Author. 8vo. 5s.

The Senses and the Intellect. By ALEXANDER BAIN, LL.D. Prof. of Logic in the Univ. of Aberdeen. Third Edition. 8vo. 15s.

Mental and Moral Science: a Compendium of Psychology and Ethics. By ALEXANDER BAIN, LL.D. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Astronomy, Meteorology, Popular Geography, &c.

Outlines of Astronomy. By Sir J. F. W. HERSCHEL, Bart. M.A. Eleventh Edition, with Plates and Woodcuts. Square crown 8vo. 12s.

Other Worlds than Ours; the Plurality of Worlds Studied under the Light of Recent Scientific Researches. By R. A. PROCTOR, B.A. F.R.A.S. Second Edition, revised and enlarged; with 14 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Sun; Ruler, Light, Fire, and Life of the Planetary System. By RICHARD A. PROCTOR, B.A. F.R.A.S. With 10 Plates (7 coloured) and 107 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. price 14s.

Saturn and its System. By the same Author. 8vo. with 14 Plates, 14s.

Ueberweg's System of Logic, and History of Logical Doctrines. Translated, with Notes and Appendices, by T. M. LINDSAY, M.A. F.R.S.E. 8vo. price 16s.

The Philosophy of Necessity; or, Natural Law as applicable to Mental, Moral, and Social Science. By CHARLES BRAY. Second Edition. 8vo. 9s.

The Education of the Feelings and Affections. By the same Author. Third Edition. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

On Force, its Mental and Moral Correlates. By the same Author. 8vo. 5s.

Time and Space; a Metaphysical Essay. By SHADWORTH H. HODGSON. 8vo. price 16s.

The Theory of Practice; an Ethical Inquiry. By SHADWORTH H. HODGSON. 2 vols. 8vo. price 24s.

A Treatise on Human Nature; being an Attempt to Introduce the Experimental Method of Reasoning into Moral Subjects. By DAVID HUME. Edited, with Notes, &c. by T. H. GREEN, Fellow, and T. H. GROSE, late Scholar, of Balliol College, Oxford. [*In the press.*]

Essays Moral, Political, and Literary. By DAVID HUME. By the same Editors. [*In the press.*]

** The above will form a new edition of DAVID HUME'S *Philosophical Works*, complete in Four Volumes, but to be had in Two separate Sections as announced.

Celestial Objects for Common Telescopes. By T. W. WEBB, M.A. F.R.A.S. Second Edition, revised and enlarged, with Map of the Moon and Woodcuts. 16mo. price 7s. 6d.

Navigation and Nautical Astronomy (Practical, Theoretical, Scientific) for the use of Students and Practical Men. By J. MERRIFIELD, F.R.A.S. and H. EVERS. 8vo. 14s.

The Canadian Dominion. By CHARLES MARSHALL. With 6 Illustrations on Wood. 8vo. price 12s. 6d.

A General Dictionary of Geography, Descriptive, Physical, Statistical, and Historical; forming a complete Gazetteer of the World. By A. KEITH JOHNSTON, F.R.S.E. New Edition. 8vo. price 31s. 6d.

A Manual of Geography, Physical, Industrial, and Political. By W. HUGHES, F.R.G.S. Prof. of Geog. in King's Coll. and in Queen's Coll. Lond. With 6 Maps. Fep. 7s. 6d.

Maunder's Treasury of Geography, Physical, Historical, Descriptive, and Political. Edited by W. HUGHES, F.R.G.S. With 7 Maps and 16 Plates. Fep. 6s.

Natural History and Popular Science.

Ganot's Elementary Treatise on Physics, Experimental and Applied, for the use of Colleges and Schools. Translated and Edited with the Author's sanction by E. ATKINSON, Ph.D. F.C.S. New Edition, revised and enlarged; with a Coloured Plate and 620 Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 15s.

The Elements of Physics or Natural Philosophy. By NEIL ARNOTT, M.D. F.R.S. Physician-Extraordinary to the Queen. Sixth Edition, re-written and completed. 2 Parts, 8vo. 21s.

Dove's Law of Storms, considered in connexion with the ordinary Movements of the Atmosphere. Translated by R. H. SCOTT, M.A. T.C.D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Sound: a Course of Eight Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain. By Professor JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D. F.R.S. New Edition, with Portrait and Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 9s.

Heat a Mode of Motion. By Professor JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D. F.R.S. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. with Woodcuts, price 10s. 6d.

Researches on Diamagnetism and Magne-Crystallic Action; including the Question of Diamagnetic Polarity. By Professor TYNDALL. With 6 Plates and many Woodcuts. 8vo. 14s.

Notes of a Course of Nine Lectures on Light, delivered at the Royal Institution, A.D. 1869. By Professor TYNDALL. Crown 8vo. 1s. sewed, or 1s. 6d. cloth.

Notes of a Course of Seven Lectures on Electrical Phenomena and Theories, delivered at the Royal Institution, A.D. 1870. By Professor TYNDALL. Crown 8vo. 1s. sewed, or 1s. 6d. cloth.

A Treatise on Electricity, in Theory and Practice. By A. DE LA RIVE, Prof. in the Academy of Geneva. Translated by C. V. WALKER, F.R.S. 3 vols. 8vo. with Woodcuts, £3 13s.

The Public Schools Atlas of Modern Geography. In Thirty-one Maps, exhibiting clearly the more important Physical Features of the Countries delineated, and Noting all the Chief Places of Historical, Commercial, and Social Interest. Edited, with an Introduction, by the Rev. G. BUTLER, M.A. Imperial quarto, price 3s. 6d. sewed; 5s. cloth. [*Nearly ready.*]

Fragments of Science for Unscientific People; a Series of detached Essays, Lectures, and Reviews. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D. F.R.S. Second Edition. 8vo. price 14s.

Light Science for Leisure Hours; a Series of Familiar Essays on Scientific Subjects, Natural Phenomena, &c. By R. A. PROCTOR, B.A. F.R.A.S. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

Light: its Influence on Life and Health. By FORBES WINSLOW, M.D. D.C.L. Oxon. (Hon.) Fep. 8vo. 6s.

The Correlation of Physical Forces. By W. R. GROVE, Q.C. V.P.R.S. Fifth Edition, revised, and Augmented by a Discourse on Continuity. 8vo. 10s. 6d. The *Discourse*, separately, price 2s. 6d.

The Beginning: its When and its How. By MUNGO PONTON, F.R.S.E. Post 8vo. with very numerous Illustrations, 18s.

Manual of Geology. By S. HAUGHTON, M.D. F.R.S. Fellow of Trin. Coll. and Prof. of Geol. in the Univ. of Dublin. Second Edition, with 66 Woodcuts. Fep. 7s. 6d.

Van Der Hoeven's Handbook of Zoology. Translated from the Second Dutch Edition by the Rev. W. CLARK, M.D. F.R.S. 2 vols. 8vo. with 24 Plates of Figures, 60s.

Professor Owen's Lectures on the Comparative Anatomy and Physiology of the Invertebrate Animals. Second Edition, with 235 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

The Comparative Anatomy and Physiology of the Vertebrate Animals. By RICHARD OWEN, F.R.S. D.C.L. With 1,472 Woodcuts. 3 vols. 8vo. £3 13s. 6d.

Insects at Home. By the Rev. J. G. WOOD, M.A., F.L.S. With a Frontispiece in Colours, 21 full-page Illustrations and about 700 smaller Illustrations from original designs engraved on Wood by G. PEARSON. 8vo. price 21s.

Homes without Hands: a Description of the Habitations of Animals, classed according to their Principle of Construction. By Rev. J. G. WOOD, M.A. F.L.S. With about 140 Vignettes on Wood. 8vo. 21s.

Strange Dwellings; being a Description of the Habitations of Animals, abridged from 'Homes without Hands.' By J. G. WOOD, M.A. F.L.S. With a New Frontispiece and about 60 other Woodcut Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

The Harmonies of Nature and Unity of Creation. By Dr. G. HARTWIG. 8vo. with numerous Illustrations, 18s.

The Sea and its Living Wonders. By the same Author. Third Edition, enlarged. 8vo. with many Illustrations, 21s.

The Tropical World. By the same Author. With 8 Chromoxylographs and 172 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

The Subterranean World. By the same Author. With 3 Maps and about 80 Woodcut Illustrations, including 8 full size of page. 8vo. price 21s.

The Polar World: a Popular Description of Man and Nature in the Arctic and Antarctic Regions of the Globe. By the same Author. With 8 Chromoxylographs, 3 Maps, and 85 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

The Origin of Civilisation and the Primitive Condition of Man; Mental and Social Condition of Savages. By Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart. M.P. F.R.S. Second Edition, revised, with 25 Woodcuts. 8vo. price 16s.

The Primitive Inhabitants of Scandinavia. Containing a Description of the Implements, Dwellings, Tombs, and Mode of Living of the Savages in the North of Europe during the Stone Age. By SVEN NILSSON. 8vo. Plates and Woodcuts, 18s.

Bible Animals; being a Description of Every Living Creature mentioned in the Scriptures, from the Ape to the Coral. By the Rev. J. G. WOOD, M.A. F.L.S. With about 100 Vignettes on Wood. 8vo. 21s.

A Familiar History of Birds. By E. STANLEY, D.D. late Lord Bishop of Norwich. Fcp. with Woodcuts, 3s. 6d.

Kirby and Spence's Introduction to Entomology, or Elements of the Natural History of Insects. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Mauder's Treasury of Natural History, or Popular Dictionary of Zoology. Revised and corrected by T. S. COBBOLD, M.D. Fcp. with 900 Woodcuts, 6s.

The Elements of Botany for Families and Schools. Tenth Edition, revised by THOMAS MOORE, F.L.S. Fcp with 154 Woodcuts, 2s. 6d.

The Treasury of Botany, or Popular Dictionary of the Vegetable Kingdom; with which is incorporated a Glossary of Botanical Terms. Edited by J. LINDLEY, F.R.S. and T. MOORE, F.L.S. Pp. 1,274, with 274 Woodcuts and 20 Steel Plates. TWO PARTS, fcp. 8vo. 12s.

The Rose Amateur's Guide. By THOMAS RIVERS. New Edition. Fcp. 4s.

Loudon's Encyclopædia of Plants; comprising the Specific Character, Description, Culture, History, &c. of all the Plants found in Great Britain. With upwards of 12,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 42s.

Mauder's Scientific and Literary Treasury; a Popular Encyclopedia of Science, Literature, and Art. New Edition, in part rewritten, with above 1,000 new articles, by J. Y. JOHNSON. Fcp. 6s.

A Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art. Fourth Edition, re-edited by the late W. T. BRANDE (the Author) and GEORGE W. COX, M.A. 3 vols. medium 8vo. price 63s. cloth.

Chemistry, Medicine, Surgery, and the Allied Sciences.

A Dictionary of Chemistry and the Allied Branches of other Sciences. By HENRY WATTS, F.C.S. assisted by eminent Scientific and Practical Chemists. 5 vols. medium 8vo. price £7 3s.

Elements of Chemistry, Theoretical and Practical. By WILLIAM A. MILLER, M.D. LL.D. Professor of Chemistry, King's College, London. Fourth Edition. 3 vols. 8vo. £3.

PART I. CHEMICAL PHYSICS, 15s.

PART II. INORGANIC CHEMISTRY, 21s.

PART III. ORGANIC CHEMISTRY, 24s.

A Manual of Chemistry, Descriptive and Theoretical. By WILLIAM ODLING, M.B. F.R.S. PART I. 8vo. 9s. PART II. nearly ready.

A Course of Practical Chemistry, for the use of Medical Students. By W. ODLING, M.B. F.R.S. New Edition, with 70 new Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Select Methods in Chemical Analysis, chiefly Inorganic. By WILLIAM CROOKES, F.R.S. With 22 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. price 12s. 6d.

- Outlines of Chemistry;** or, Brief Notes of Chemical Facts. By the same Author. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- Lectures on Animal Chemistry** Delivered at the Royal College of Physicians in 1865. By the same Author. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- Lectures on the Chemical Changes of Carbon,** delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain. By the same Author. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- Chemical Notes for the Lecture Room.** By THOMAS WOOD, F.C.S. 2 vols. crown 8vo. I. on Heat, &c. price 3s. 6d. II. on the Metals, price 5s.
- A Treatise on Medical Electricity,** Theoretical and Practical; and its Use in the Treatment of Paralysis, Neuralgia, and other Diseases. By JULIUS ALTHAUS, M.D. &c. Second Edition, with Plate and 62 Woodcuts. Post 8vo. price 15s.
- The Diagnosis, Pathology, and Treatment of Diseases of Women;** including the Diagnosis of Pregnancy. By GRAYLI HEWITT, M.D. &c. President of the Obstetrical Society of London. Second Edition, enlarged; with 116 Woodcuts. 8vo. 24s.
- Lectures on the Diseases of Infancy and Childhood.** By CHARLES WEST, M.D. &c. Fifth Edition. 8vo. 16s.
- On Some Disorders of the Nervous System in Childhood.** Being the Lumleian Lectures delivered before the Royal College of Physicians in March 1871. By CHARLES WEST, M.D. Crown 8vo. 5s.
- On the Surgical Treatment of Children's Diseases.** By T. HOLMES, M.A. &c. late Surgeon to the Hospital for Sick Children. Second Edition, with 9 Plates and 112 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.
- A System of Surgery, Theoretical and Practical,** in Treatises by Various Authors. Edited by T. HOLMES, M.A. &c. Surgeon and Lecturer on Surgery at St. George's Hospital, and Surgeon-in-Chief to the Metropolitan Police. Second Edition, thoroughly revised, with numerous Illustrations. 5 vols. 8vo. £5 5s.
- Lectures on the Principles and Practice of Physic.** By Sir THOMAS WATSON, Bart. M.D. Physician-in-Ordinary to the Queen. Fifth Edition, thoroughly revised. 2 vols. 8vo. price 36s.
- Lectures on Surgical Pathology.** By Sir JAMES PAGET, Bart. F.R.S. Third Edition, revised and re-edited by the Author and Professor W. TURNER, M.B. 8vo. with 131 Woodcuts, 21s.
- Cooper's Dictionary of Practical Surgery and Encyclopædia of Surgical Science.** New Edition, brought down to the present time. By S. A. LANE, Surgeon to St. Mary's Hospital, &c. assisted by various Eminent Surgeons. VOL. II. 8vo. completing the work. [*In the press.*]
- On Chronic Bronchitis,** especially as connected with Gout, Emphysema, and Diseases of the Heart. By E. HEADLAM GREENHOW, M.D. F.R.C.P. &c. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- The Climate of the South of France** as Sited to Invalids; with Notices of Mediterranean and other Winter Stations. By C. T. WILLIAMS, M.A. M.D. Oxon. Physician to the Hospital for Consumption at Brompton. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- Pulmonary Consumption;** its Nature, Varieties, and Treatment: with an Analysis of One Thousand Cases to exemplify its Duration. By C. J. B. WILLIAMS, M.D. F.R.S. and C. T. WILLIAMS, M.A. M.D. Oxon. Physicians to the Hospital for Consumption at Brompton. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.
- Clinical Lectures on Diseases of the Liver, Jaundice, and Abdominal Dropsy.** By C. MURCHISON, M.D. Physician and Lecturer on the Practice of Medicine, Middlesex Hospital. Post 8vo. with 26 Woodcuts, 10s. 6d.
- Anatomy, Descriptive and Surgical.** By HENRY GRAY, F.R.S. With about 410 Woodcuts from Dissections. Fifth Edition, by T. HOLMES, M.A. Cantab. With a New Introduction by the Editor. Royal 8vo. 28s.
- Clinical Notes on Diseases of the Larynx,** investigated and treated with the assistance of the Laryngoscope. By W. MARCET, M.D. F.R.S. Crown 8vo. with 5 Lithographs, 6s.
- The House I Live in;** or, Popular Illustrations of the Structure and Functions of the Human Body. Edited by T. G. GIRTIN. New Edition, with 25 Woodcuts. 16mo. price 2s. 6d.
- Physiological Anatomy and Physiology of Man.** By the late R. B. TODD, M.D. F.R.S. and W. BOWMAN, F.R.S. of King's College. With numerous Illustrations. VOL. II. 8vo. 25s.
- VOL. I. New Edition by Dr. LIONEL S. BEALE, F.R.S. in course of publication, with numerous Illustrations. PARTS I. and II. price 7s. 6d. each.

Outlines of Physiology, Human and Comparative. By JOHN MARSHALL, F.R.C.S. Professor of Surgery in University College, London, and Surgeon to the University College Hospital. 2 vols. crown 8vo. with 122 Woodcuts, 32s.

Copland's Dictionary of Practical Medicine, abridged from the larger work, and throughout brought down to the present state of Medical Science. 8vo. 36s.

A Manual of Materia Medica and Therapeutics, abridged from Dr. PEREIRA's *Elements* by F. J. FARRE, M.D. assisted by R. BENTLEY, M.R.C.S. and by R. WARINGTON, F.R.S. 1 vol. 8vo. with 90 Woodcuts, 21s.

Thomson's Conspectus of the British Pharmacopœia. Twenty-fifth Edition, corrected by E. LLOYD BIRKETT, M.D. 18mo. 6s.

The Fine Arts, and Illustrated Editions.

In Fairyland; Pictures from the Elf-World. By RICHARD DOYLE. With a Poem by W. ALLINGHAM. With Sixteen Plates, containing Thirty-six Designs printed in Colours. Folio, 31s. 6d.

Life of John Gibson, R.A. Sculptor. Edited by Lady EASTLAKE. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Materials for a History of Oil Painting. By Sir CHARLES LOCKE EASTLAKE, sometime President of the Royal Academy. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

Albert Durer, his Life and Works; including Autobiographical Papers and Complete Catalogues. By WILLIAM B. SCOTT. With Six Etchings by the Author and other Illustrations. 8vo. 16s.

Half-Hour Lectures on the History and Practice of the Fine and Ornamental Arts. By W. B. SCOTT. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. with 50 Woodcut Illustrations, 8s. 6d.

Italian Sculptors: being a History of Sculpture in Northern, Southern, and Eastern Italy. By C. C. PERKINS. With 30 Etchings and 13 Wood Engravings. Imperial 8vo. 42s.

Tuscan Sculptors, their Lives, Works, and Times. By the same Author. With 45 Etchings and 28 Wood Engravings. 2 vols. imperial 8vo. 63s.

The Chorale Book for England: the Hymns Translated by Miss C. WINKWORTH; the Tunes arranged by Prof. W. S. BENNETT and OTTO GOLDSCHMIDT. Fcp. 4to. 12s. 6d.

Six Lectures on Harmony. Delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain. By G. A. MACFARREN. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The New Testament, illustrated with Wood Engravings after the Early Masters chiefly of the Italian School. Crown 4to. 63s. cloth, gilt top; or £5 5s. morocco.

The Life of Man Symbolised by the Months of the Year in their Seasons and Phases. Text selected by RICHARD PIGOT. 25 Illustrations on Wood from Original Designs by JOHN LEIGHTON, F.S.A. Quarto, 42s.

Cats' and Farlie's Moral Emblems; with Aphorisms, Adages, and Proverbs of all Nations: comprising 121 Illustrations on Wood by J. LEIGHTON, F.S.A. with an appropriate Text by R. PIGOT. Imperial 8vo. 31s. 6d.

Sacred and Legendary Art. By Mrs. JAMESON. 6 vols. square crown 8vo. price £5 15s. 6d. as follows:—

Legends of the Saints and Martyrs. Fifth Edition, with 19 Etchings and 187 Woodcuts. 2 vols. price 31s. 6d.

Legends of the Monastic Orders. Third Edition, with 11 Etchings and 88 Woodcuts. 1 vol. price 21s.

Legends of the Madonna. Third Edition, with 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. 1 vol. price 21s.

The History of Our Lord, with that of His Types and Precursors. Completed by Lady EASTLAKE. Revised Edition, with 13 Etchings and 281 Woodcuts. 2 vols. price 42s.

Lyra Germanica, the Christian Year. Translated by CATHERINE WINKWORTH; with 125 Illustrations on Wood drawn by J. LEIGHTON, F.S.A. Quarto, 21s.

Lyra Germanica, the Christian Life. Translated by CATHERINE WINKWORTH; with about 200 Woodcut Illustrations by J. LEIGHTON, F.S.A. and other Artists. Quarto, 21s.

The Useful Arts, Manufactures, &c.

Gwilt's Encyclopædia of Architecture, with above 1,600 Woodcuts. Fifth Edition, with Alterations and considerable Additions, by WYATT PAPWORTH. 8vo. price 52s. 6d.

A Manual of Architecture: being a Concise History and Explanation of the principal Styles of European Architecture. Ancient, Mediæval, and Renaissance; with their Chief Variations and a Glossary of Technical Terms. By THOMAS MITCHELL. With 150 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

History of the Gothic Revival; an Attempt to shew how far the taste for Mediæval Architecture was retained in England during the last two centuries, and has been re-developed in the present. By CHARLES L. EASTLAKE, Architect. With many Illustrations. Imperial 8vo. price 31s. 6d.

Hints on Household Taste in Furniture, Upholstery, and other Details. By CHARLES L. EASTLAKE, Architect. Second Edition, with about 90 Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. 18s.

The Engineer's Handbook; explaining the principles which should guide the young Engineer in the Construction of Machinery. By C. S. LOWENDES. Post 8vo. 5s.

Lathes and Turning, Simple, Mechanical, and Ornamental. By W. HENRY NORTHOTT. With about 240 Illustrations on Steel and Wood. 8vo. 18s.

Principles of Mechanism, designed for the use of Students in the Universities, and for Engineering Students generally. By R. WILLIS, M.A. F.R.S. &c. Jacksonian Professor in the Univ. of Cambridge. Second Edition; with 374 Woodcuts. 8vo. 18s.

Handbook of Practical Telegraphy. By R. S. CULLEY, Memb. Inst. C.E. Engineer-in-Chief of Telegraphs to the Post-Office. Fifth Edition, revised and enlarged; with 118 Woodcuts and 9 Plates. 8vo. price 14s.

Ure's Dictionary of Arts, Manufactures, and Mines. Sixth Edition, rewritten and greatly enlarged by ROBERT HUNT, F.R.S. assisted by numerous Contributors. With 2,000 Woodcuts. 3 vols. medium 8vo. £4 14s. 6d.

Treatise on Mills and Millwork. By Sir W. FAIRBAIRN, Bart. F.R.S. New Edition, with 18 Plates and 322 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

Useful Information for Engineers. By the same Author. FIRST, SECOND, and THIRD SERIES, with many Plates and Woodcuts. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. each.

The Application of Cast and Wrought Iron to Building Purposes. By the same Author. Fourth Edition, with 6 Plates and 118 Woodcuts. 8vo. 16s.

Iron Ship Building, its History and Progress, as comprised in a Series of Experimental Researches. By Sir W. FAIRBAIRN, Bart. F.R.S. With 4 Plates and 130 Woodcuts, 8vo. 18s.

Encyclopædia of Civil Engineering, Historical, Theoretical, and Practical. By E. CRESY, C.E. With above 3,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 42s.

A Treatise on the Steam Engine, in its various Applications to Mines, Mills, Steam Navigation, Railways, and Agriculture. By J. BOURNE, C.E. New Edition; with Portrait, 37 Plates, and 546 Woodcuts. 4to. 42s.

Catechism of the Steam Engine, in its various Applications to Mines, Mills, Steam Navigation, Railways, and Agriculture. By JOHN BOURNE, C.E. New Edition, with 89 Woodcuts. Fcp. 6s.

Recent Improvements in the Steam-Engine. By JOHN BOURNE, C.E. New Edition, including many New Examples, with 124 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

Bourne's Examples of Modern Steam, Air, and Gas Engines of the most Approved Types, as employed for Pumping, for Driving Machinery, for Locomotion, and for Agriculture, minutely and practically described. In course of publication, to be completed in Twenty-four Parts, price 2s. 6d. each, forming One Volume, with about 50 Plates and 400 Woodcuts.

A Treatise on the Screw Propeller, Screw Vessels, and Screw Engines, as adapted for purposes of Peace and War. By JOHN BOURNE, C.E. Third Edition, with 54 Plates and 287 Woodcuts. Quarto, price 63s.

Handbook of the Steam Engine. By JOHN BOURNE, C.E. forming a KEY to the Author's Catechism of the Steam Engine. With 67 Woodcuts. Fcp. 9s.

A History of the Machine-Wrought Hosiery and Lace Manufactures. By WILLIAM FELKIN, F.L.S. F.S.S. With several Illustrations. Royal 8vo. 21s.

Mitchell's Manual of Practical Assaying. Third Edition for the most part re-written, with all the recent Discoveries incorporated. By W. CROOKES, F.R.S. With 188 Woodcuts. 8vo. 28s.

Reimann's Handbook of Aniline and its Derivatives; a Treatise on the Manufacture of Aniline and Aniline Colours. Revised and edited by WILLIAM CROOKES, F.R.S. 8vo. with 5 Woodcuts, 10s. 6d.

On the Manufacture of Beet-Root Sugar in England and Ireland. By WILLIAM CROOKES, F.R.S. With 11 Woodcuts. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Practical Treatise on Metallurgy, adapted from the last German Edition of Professor KERL'S *Metallurgy* by W. CROOKES, F.R.S. &c. and E. RÖHRIG, Ph.D. M.E. 3 vols. 8vo. with 625 Woodcuts, price £4 19s.

The Art of Perfumery; the History and Theory of Odours, and the Methods of Extracting the Aromas of Plants. By Dr. PIESSE, F.C.S. Third Edition, with 53 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Chemical, Natural, and Physical Magic, for Juveniles during the Holidays. By the same Author. With 38 Woodcuts. Fcp. 6s.

Loudon's Encyclopædia of Agriculture: comprising the Laying-out, Improvement, and Management of Landed Property, and the Cultivation and Economy of the Productions of Agriculture. With 1,100 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

Loudon's Encyclopædia of Gardening: comprising the Theory and Practice of Horticulture, Floriculture, Arboriculture, and Landscape Gardening. With 1,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

Bayldon's Art of Valuing Rents and Tillages, and Claims of Tenants upon Quitting Farms, both at Michaelmas and Lady-Day. Eighth Edition, revised by J. C. MORTON. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Religious and Moral Works.

Old Testament Synonyms, their Bearing on Christian Faith and Practice. By the Rev. R. B. GIRDLESTONE, M.A. 8vo. [Nearly ready.]

Fundamentals; or, Bases of Belief concerning Man and God: a Handbook of Mental, Moral, and Religious Philosophy. By the Rev. T. GRIFFITH, M.A. 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

An Introduction to the Theology of the Church of England, in an Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles. By the Rev. T. P. BOULTBEE, M.A. Fcp. 8vo. price 6s.

The Student's Compendium of the Book of Common Prayer; being Notes Historical and Explanatory of the Liturgy of the Church of England. By the Rev. H. ALDEN NASH. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

Prayers Selected from the Collection of the late Baron Bunsen, and Translated by CATHERINE WINKWORTH. PART I. For the Family. PART II. Prayers and Meditations for Private Use. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

Churches and their Creeds. By the Rev. Sir PHILIP PERRING, Bart. late Scholar of Trin. Coll. Cambridge, and University Medallist. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Bible and Popular Theology; a Re-statement of Truths and Principles, with special reference to recent works of Dr. Liddon, Lord Hatherley, and the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. By G. VANCE SMITH, B.A. Ph.D. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Truth of the Bible; Evidence from the Mosaic and other Records of Creation; the Origin and Antiquity of Man; the Science of Scripture; and from the Archaeology of Different Nations of the Earth. By the Rev. B. W. SAVILE, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Considerations on the Revision of the English New Testament. By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D. Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Post 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

An Exposition of the 39 Articles, Historical and Doctrinal. By E. HAROLD BROWNE, D.D. Lord Bishop of Ely. Ninth Edition. 8vo. 16s.

Examination-Questions on Bishop Browne's Exposition of the Articles. By the Rev. J. GORLE, M.A. Fcp. 3s. 6d.

The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul; with Dissertations on the Ships and Navigation of the Ancients. By JAMES SMITH, F.R.S. Crown 8vo. Charts, 10s. 6d.

The Life and Epistles of St.

Paul. By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M.A. and the Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D. Dean of Chester. Three Editions:—

LIBRARY EDITION, with all the Original Illustrations, Maps, Landscapes on Steel, Woodcuts, &c. 2 vols. 4to. 48s.

INTERMEDIATE EDITION, with a Selection of Maps, Plates, and Woodcuts. 2 vols. square crown 8vo. 31s. 6d.

STUDENT'S EDITION, revised and condensed, with 46 Illustrations and Maps. 1 vol. crown 8vo. 9s.

Evidence of the Truth of the

Christian Religion derived from the Literal Fulfilment of Prophecy. By ALEXANDER KEITH, D.D. 37th Edition, with numerous Plates, in square 8vo. 12s. 6d.; also the 39th Edition, in post 8vo. with 5 Plates, 6s.

The History and Destiny of the World and of the Church, according to Scripture. By the same Author. Square 8vo. with 40 Illustrations, 10s.

The History and Literature of

the Israelites, according to the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. By C. DE ROTHSCHILD and A. DE ROTHSCHILD. Second Edition. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

VOL. I. *The Historical Books*, 7s. 6d.

VOL. II. *The Prophetic and Poetical Writings*, price 5s.

Ewald's History of Israel to the

Death of Moses. Translated from the German. Edited, with a Preface and an Appendix, by RUSSELL MARTINEAU, M.A. Second Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

The See of Rome in the Middle

Ages. By the Rev. OSWALD J. REICHEL, B.C.L. and M.A. 8vo. 18s.

The Pontificate of Pius the Ninth;

being the Third Edition, enlarged and continued, of 'Rome and its Ruler.' By J. F. MAGUIRE, M.P. Post 8vo. Portrait, price 12s. 6d.

Ignatius Loyola and the Early

Jesuits. By STEWART ROSE. New Edition, revised. 8vo. with Portrait, 16s.

An Introduction to the Study of

the New Testament, Critical, Exegetical, and Theological. By the Rev. S. DAVIDSON, D.D. LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

A Critical and Grammatical Com-

mentary on St. Paul's Epistles. By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D. Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. 8vo.

Galatians, Fourth Edition, 8s. 6d.

Ephesians, Fourth Edition, 8s. 6d.

Pastoral Epistles, Fourth Edition, 10s. 6d.

Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, Third Edition, 10s. 6d.

Thessalonians, Third Edition, 7s. 6d.

Historical Lectures on the Life of

Our Lord Jesus Christ: being the Hulsean Lectures for 1859. By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D. Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Fifth Edition. 8vo. 12s.

The Greek Testament; with Notes,

Grammatical and Exegetical. By the Rev. W. WEBSTER, M.A. and the Rev. W. F. WILKINSON, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. £2 4s.

Horne's Introduction to the Critical

Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. Twelfth Edition; with 4 Maps and 22 Woodcuts. 4 vols. 8vo. 42s.

Compendious Introduction to the

Study of the Bible. Edited by the Rev. JOHN AYRE, M.A. With Maps, &c. Post 8vo. 6s.

The Treasury of Bible Know-

ledge; being a Dictionary of the Books, Persons, Places, Events, and other Matters of which mention is made in Holy Scripture. By Rev. J. AYRE, M.A. With Maps, 15 Plates, and numerous Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

Every-day Scripture Difficulties

explained and illustrated. By J. E. PRESCOTT, M.A. I. *Matthew and Mark*; II. *Luke and John*. 2 vols. 8vo. price 9s. each.

The Pentateuch and Book of

Joshua Critically Examined. By the Right Rev. J. W. COLENSO, D.D. Lord Bishop of Natal. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

The Four Cardinal Virtues; Six

Sermons for the Day, in relation to the Public and Private Life of Catholics. By the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. Crown 8vo. with Frontispiece, 7s. 6d.

The Formation of Christendom.

By T. W. ALLIES. PARTS I. and II. 8vo. price 12s. each.

Four Discourses of Chrysostom,

chiefly on the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Translated by F. ALLEN, B.A. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Christendom's Divisions; a Philosophical Sketch of the Divisions of the Christian Family in East and West. By EDMUND S. FFOULKES. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d. PART II. *Greeks and Latins*, price 15s.

Thoughts for the Age. By ELIZABETH M. SEWELL, Author of 'Amy Herbert.' New Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

Passing Thoughts on Religion. By the same Author. Fcp. 5s.

Self-examination before Confirmation. By the same Author. 32mo. 1s. 6d.

Thoughts for the Holy Week, for Young Persons. By the same Author. New Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 2s.

Readings for a Month Preparatory to Confirmation from Writers of the Early and English Church. By the same. Fcp. 4s.

Readings for Every Day in Lent, compiled from the Writings of Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR. By the same Author. Fcp. 5s.

Preparation for the Holy Communion; the Devotions chiefly from the works of JEREMY TAYLOR. By the same. 32mo. 3s.

Principles of Education drawn from Nature and Revelation, and Applied to Female Education in the Upper Classes. By the same Author. 2 vols. fcp. 12s. 6d.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor's Entire Works; with Life by BISHOP HEBBER. Revised and corrected by the Rev. C. P. EDEN. 10 vols. £5 5s.

England and Christendom. By ARCHBISHOP MANNING, D.D. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

Singers and Songs of the Church: being Biographical Sketches of the Hymn-Writers in all the principal Collections; with Notes on their Psalms and Hymns. By JOSIAH MILLER, M.A. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

'Spiritual Songs' for the Sundays and Holidays throughout the Year. By J. S. B. MONSELL, LL.D. Vicar of Egham and Rural Dean. Fourth Edition, Sixth Thousand. Fcp. price 4s. 6d.

The Beatitudes. By the same Author. Third Edition, revised. Fcp. 3s. 6d.

His Presence not his Memory, 1855. By the same Author, in memory of his SON. Sixth Edition. 16mo. 1s.

Lyra Germanica, translated from the German by Miss C. WINKWORTH. FIRST SERIES, the *Christian Year*, Hymns for the Sundays and Chief Festivals of the Church; SECOND SERIES, the *Christian Life*. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d. each SERIES.

Lyra Eucharistica; Hymns and Verses on the Holy Communion, Ancient and Modern; with other Poems. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. Second Edition. Fcp. 5s.

Shipley's Lyra Messianica. Fcp. 5s.

Shipley's Lyra Mystica. Fcp. 5s.

Endeavours after the Christian Life: Discourses. By JAMES MARTINEAU. Fourth Edition. Post 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

Invocation of Saints and Angels; for the use of Members of the English Church. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. 24mo. 3s. 6d.

Travels, Voyages, &c.

How to See Norway. By Captain J. R. CAMPBELL. With Map and 5 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

Pau and the Pyrenees. By Count HENRY RUSSELL, Member of the Alpine Club. With 2 Maps. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

Scenes in the Sunny South; including the Atlas Mountains and the Oases of the Sahara in Algeria. By Lieut.-Col. the Hon. C. S. VEREKER, M.A. Commandant of the Limerick Artillery Militia. 2 vols. post 8vo. price 21s.

Hours of Exercise in the Alps. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D., F.R.S. Second Edition, with Seven Woodcuts by E. Whymper. Crown 8vo. price 12s. 6d.

The Playground of Europe. By LESLIE STEPHEN, late President of the Alpine Club. With 4 Illustrations on Wood by E. Whymper. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Westward by Rail: the New Route to the East. By W. F. RAE. Second Edition, enlarged. Post 8vo. with Map, price 10s. 6d.

Travels in the Central Caucasus and Bashan, including Visits to Ararat and Tabreez and Ascents of Kazbek and Elbruz. By DOUGLAS W. FRESHFIELD. Square crown 8vo. with Maps, &c., 18s.

Cadore or Titian's Country. By JOSIAH GILBERT, one of the Authors of the 'Dolomite Mountains.' With Map, Facsimile, and 40 Illustrations. Imp. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

Zigzagging amongst Dolomites; with more than 300 Illustrations by the Author. By the Author of 'How we Spent the Summer.' Oblong 4to. price 15s.

The Dolomite Mountains. Excursions through Tyrol, Carinthia, Carniola, and Friuli. By J. GILBERT and G. C. CHURCHILL, F.R.G.S. With numerous Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. 21s.

How we Spent the Summer; or, a Voyage en Zigzag in Switzerland and Tyrol with some Members of the ALPINE CLUB. Third Edition, re-drawn. In oblong 4to. with about 300 Illustrations, 15s.

Pictures in Tyrol and Elsewhere. From a Family Sketch-Book. By the same Author. Second Edition. 4to. with many Illustrations, 21s.

Beaten Tracks; or, Pen and Pencil Sketches in Italy. By the same Author. With 42 Plates of Sketches. 8vo. 16s.

The Alpine Club Map of the Chain of Mont Blanc, from an actual Survey in 1863—1864. By A. ADAMS-REILLY, F.R.G.S. M.A.C. In Chromolithography on extra stout drawing paper 28in. x 17in. price 10s. or mounted on canvas in a folding case, 12s. 6d.

History of Discovery in our Australasian Colonies, Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand, from the Earliest Date to the Present Day. By WILLIAM HOWITT. 2 vols. 8vo. with 3 Maps, 20s.

The Capital of the Tycoon; a Narrative of a 3 Years' Residence in Japan. By Sir RUTHERFORD ALCOCK, K.C.B. 2 vols. 8vo. with numerous Illustrations, 42s.

Pilgrimages in the Pyrenees and Landes. By DENYS SHYNE LAWLOR. Crown 8vo. with Frontispiece and Vignette, price 15s.

Guide to the Pyrenees, for the use of Mountaineers. By CHARLES PACKE. Second Edition, with Maps, &c. and Appendix. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Alpine Guide. By JOHN BALL, M.R.I.A. late President of the Alpine Club. Post 8vo. with Maps and other Illustrations.

Guide to the Eastern Alps, price 10s. 6d.

Guide to the Western Alps, including Mont Blanc, Monte Rosa, Zermatt, &c. price 6s. 6d.

Guide to the Central Alps, including all the Oberland District, price 7s. 6d.

Introduction on Alpine Travelling in general, and on the Geology of the Alps, price 1s. Either of the Three Volumes or Parts of the *Alpine Guide* may be had with this INTRODUCTION prefixed, price 1s. extra.

The Northern Heights of London; or, Historical Associations of Hampstead, Highgate, Muswell Hill, Hornsey, and Islington. By WILLIAM HOWITT. With about 40 Woodcuts. Square crown 8vo. 21s.

The Rural Life of England. By the same Author. With Woodcuts by Bewick and Williams. Medium 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Visits to Remarkable Places: Old Halls, Battle-Fields, and Scenes illustrative of striking Passages in English History and Poetry. By the same Author. 2 vols. square crown 8vo. with Wood Engravings, 25s.

Works of Fiction.

Novels and Tales. By the Right Hon. B. DISRAELI. Cabinet Editions, complete in Ten Volumes, crown 8vo. price 6s. each, as follows:—

LOTHAIR, 6s.	VENETIA, 6s.
CONINGSBY, 6s.	ALROY, IXION, &c. 6s.
SYBEL, 6s.	YOUNG DUKE, &c. 6s.
TANCRED, 6s.	VIVIAN GREY, 6s.
CONTARINI FLEMING, &c. 6s.	
HENRIETTA TEMPLE, 6s.	

A Visit to my Discontented Cousin. Reprinted, with some Additions, from *Fraser's Magazine*. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

Stories and Tales. By E. M. SEWELL. Comprising *Amy Herbert*; *Gertrude*; the *Earl's Daughter*; the *Experience of Life*; *Cleve Hall*; *Ivors*; *Katharine Ashton*; *Margaret Percival*; *Laneton Parsonage*; and *Ursula*. The Ten Works complete in Eight Volumes, crown 8vo. bound in leather and contained in a Box, price TWO GUINEAS.

Our Children's Story. By One of their Gossips. By the Author of 'Voyage en Zigzag,' &c. Small 4to. with Sixty Illustrations by the Author, price 10s. 6d.

Cabinet Edition. in crown 8vo. of
Stories and Tales by Miss SEWELL:—

AMY HERBERT, 2s. 6d.	KATHARINE ASHTON, 3s. 6d.
GERTRUDE, 2s. 6d.	MARGARET PERCI- NAL, 5s.
EARL'S DAUGHTER, 2s. 6d.	LANETON PARSON- AGE, 4s. 6d.
EXPERIENCE OF LIFE, 2s. 6d.	URSULA, 4s. 6d.
CLEVE HALL, 3s. 6d.	
IVORS, 3s. 6d.	

A Glimpse of the World. Fcp. 7s. 6d.

Journal of a Home Life. Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.

**After Life; a Sequel to the 'Journal of a Home
Life.'** Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Modern Novelist's Library.

Each Work, in crown 8vo. complete in a
Single Volume:—

MELVILLE'S GLADIATORS, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d.
cloth.

— GOOD FOR NOTHING, 2s. boards;
2s. 6d. cloth.

— HOLMBY HOUSE, 2s. boards;
2s. 6d. cloth.

— INTERPRETER, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d.
cloth.

— KATE COVENTRY, 2s. boards;
2s. 6d. cloth.

— QUEEN'S MARIES, 2s. boards;
2s. 6d. cloth.

TROLLOPE'S WARDEN, 1s. 6d. boards; 2s.
cloth.

— BARCHESTER TOWERS, 2s. boards;
2s. 6d. cloth.

BRANLEY-MOORE'S SIX SISTERS OF THE
VALLEYS, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

Irne; a Tale. By W. STEWART TRENCH,
Author of 'Realities of Irish Life.' Second
Edition. 2 vols. post 8vo. price 21s.

**The Giant; a Witch's Story for English
Boys.** Edited by Miss SEWELL, Author of
'Amy Herbert,' &c. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

**Uncle Peter's Fairy Tale for the XIXth
Century.** By the same Author and Editor.
Fcp. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

**The Home at Heatherbrae; a
Tale.** By the Author of 'Everley.' Fcp.
8vo. price 5s.

**Becker's Gallus; or, Roman Scenes of
the Time of Augustus.** Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

**Becker's Charicles: Illustrative of
Private Life of the Ancient Greeks.** Post
8vo. 7s. 6d.

Tales of Ancient Greece. By GEORGE
W. COX, M.A. late Scholar of Trin. Coll.
Oxford. Crown 8vo. price 6s. 6d.

**Cabinet Edition of Novels and
Tales by G. J. WHYTE MELVILLE:—**

THE GLADIATORS, 5s. HOLMBY HOUSE, 5s.
DIGBY GRAND, 5s. GOOD FOR NOTHING, 6s.
KATE COVENTRY, 5s. QUEEN'S MARIES, 6s.
GENERAL BOUNCE, 5s. THE INTERPRETER, 5s.

Wonderful Stories from Norway,
Sweden, and Iceland. Adapted and arranged
by JULIA GODDARD. With an Introductory
Essay by the Rev. G. W. COX, M.A. and
Six Illustrations. Square post 8vo. 6s.

Poetry and The Drama.

Thomas Moore's Poetical Works,
the only Editions containing the Author's
last Copyright Additions:—

Shamrock Edition, price 3s. 6d.

Ruby Edition, with Portrait, 6s.

Cabinet Edition, 10 vols. fcp. 8vo. 35s.

People's Edition, Portrait, &c. 10s. 6d.

Library Edition, Portrait & Vignette, 14s.

Moore's Lalla Rookh, Tenniel's Edi-
tion, with 68 Wood Engravings from
Original Drawings and other Illustrations.
Fcp. 4to. 21s.

Moore's Irish Melodies, Maclise's
Edition, with 161 Steel Plates from Original
Drawings. Super-royal 8vo. 31s. 6d.

**Miniature Edition of Moore's Irish
Melodies,** with Maclise's Illustrations (as
above), reduced in Lithography. Imp.
16mo. 10s. 6d.

Southey's Poetical Works, with
the Author's last Corrections and copyright
Additions. Library Edition. Medium 8vo.
with Portrait and Vignette, 14s.

**Lays of Ancient Rome; with *Ivry*
and the *Armada.*** By the Right Hon. LORD
MACAULAY. 16mo. 4s. 6d.

**Lord Macaulay's Lays of Ancient
Rome.** With 90 Illustrations on Wood,
Original and from the Antique, from
Drawings by G. SCHARF. Fcp. 4to. 21s.

**Miniature Edition of Lord Macaulay's
Lays of Ancient Rome,** with Scharf's
Illustrations (as above) reduced in Litho-
graphy. Imp. 16mo. 10s. 6d.

Goldsmith's Poetical Works, Illus-
trated with Wood Engravings from Designs
by Members of the ETCHING CLUB. Imp.
16mo. 7s. 6d.

John Jerningham's Journal. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

The Mad War Planet, and other Poems. By WILLIAM HOWITT, Author of 'Visits to Remarkable Places,' &c. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

Eucharis; a Poem. By F. REGINALD STATHAM (Francis Reynolds), Author of 'Alice Rushton, and other Poems' and 'Glaphyra, and other Poems.' Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

Poems of Bygone Years. Edited by the Author of 'Amy Herbert.' Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

Poems. By JEAN INGELOW. Fifteenth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

Poems by Jean Ingelow. With nearly 100 Illustrations by Eminent Artists, engraved on Wood by DALZIEL Brothers. Fcp. 4to. 21s.

Mopsa the Fairy. By JEAN INGELOW. With Eight Illustrations engraved on Wood. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

A Story of Doom, and other Poems. By JEAN INGELOW. Third Edition. Fcp. price 5s.

Bowdler's Family Shakspeare, cheaper Genuine Edition, complete in 1 vol large type, with 36 Woodcut Illustrations, price 14s. or in 6 pocket vols. 3s. 6d. each.

Arundines Cami. Collegit atque edidit H. DRURY, M.A. Editio Sexta, curavit H. J. HODGSON, M.A. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

Horatii Opera, Pocket Edition, with carefully corrected Text, Marginal References, and Introduction. Edited by the Rev. J. E. YONGE, M.A. Square 18mo. 4s. 6d.

Horatii Opera, Library Edition, with Copious English Notes, Marginal References and Various Readings. Edited by the Rev. J. E. YONGE, M.A. 8vo. 21s.

The Æneid of Virgil Translated into English Verse. By JOHN CONINGTON, M.A. Corpus Professor of Latin in the University of Oxford. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 9s.

Hunting Songs and Miscellaneous Verses. By R. E. EGERTON WARBURTON. Second Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

Works by Edward Yardley:—
FANTASTIC STORIES, fcp. 3s. 6d.
MELUSINE and other POEMS, fcp. 5s.
HORACE'S ODES translated into ENGLISH VERSE, crown 8vo. 6s.
SUPPLEMENTARY STORIES and POEMS, fcp. 3s. 6d.

Rural Sports, &c.

Encyclopædia of Rural Sports; a Complete Account, Historical, Practical, and Descriptive, of Hunting, Shooting, Fishing, Racing, &c. By D. P. BLAINE. With above 600 Woodcuts (20 from Designs by JOHN LEECH). 8vo. 21s.

The Dead Shot, or Sportsman's Complete Guide; a Treatise on the Use of the Gun, Dog-breaking, Pigeon-shooting, &c. By MARKSMAN. Fcp. with Plates, 5s.

A Book on Angling: being a Complete Treatise on the Art of Angling in every branch, including full Illustrated Lists of Salmon Flies. By FRANCIS FRANCIS. Second Edition, with Portrait and 15 other Plates, plain and coloured. Post 8vo. 15s.

Wilcocks's Sea-Fisherman: comprising the Chief Methods of Hook and Line Fishing in the British and other Seas, a glance at Nets, and remarks on Boats and Boating. Second Edition, enlarged, with 80 Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 12s. 6d.

The Fly-Fisher's Entomology. By ALFRED RONALDS. With coloured Representations of the Natural and Artificial Insect. Sixth Edition, with 20 coloured Plates. 8vo. 14s.

The Book of the Roach. By GREVILLE FENNELL, of 'The Field.' Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

Blaine's Veterinary Art: a Treatise on the Anatomy, Physiology, and Curative Treatment of the Diseases of the Horse, Neat Cattle, and Sheep. Seventh Edition, revised and enlarged by C. STEEL. 8vo. with Plates and Woodcuts, 18s.

Horses and Stables. By Colonel F. FITZWYGRAM, XV. the King's Hussars. With 24 Plates of Woodcut Illustrations, containing very numerous Figures. 8vo. 15s.

Youatt on the Horse. Revised and enlarged by W. WATSON, M.R.C.V.S. 8vo. with numerous Woodcuts, 12s. 6d.

Youatt on the Dog. (By the same Author.) 8vo. with numerous Woodcuts, 6s.

The Dog in Health and Disease
By STONEHENGE. With 70 Wood Engravings. New Edition. Square crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Greyhound. By the same Author. Revised Edition, with 24 Portraits of Greyhounds. Square crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Robbins's Cavalry Catechism; or, Instructions on Cavalry Exercise and Field Movements, Brigade Movements, Outpost Duty, Cavalry supporting Artillery, Artillery attached to Cavalry. 12mo. price 5s.

The Horse's Foot, and how to keep it Sound. By W. MILES, Esq. Ninth Edition, with Illustrations. Imp. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

A Plain Treatise on Horse-shoeing. By the same Author. Sixth Edition, post 8vo. with Illustrations, 2s. 6d.

Stables and Stable Fittings. By the same. Imp. 8vo. with 13 Plates, 15s.

Remarks on Horses' Teeth, addressed to Purchasers. By the same. Post 8vo. 1s. 6d

The Ox, his Diseases and their Treatment; with an Essay on Parturition in the Cow. By J. R. DOBSON, M.R.C.V.S. Crown 8vo. with Illustrations, 7s. 6d.

Works of Utility and General Information.

The Law of Nations Considered as Independent Political Communities. By Sir TRAVERS TWISS, D.C.L. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s. or separately, PART I. *Peace*, 12s. PART II. *War*, 18s.

The Theory and Practice of Banking. By HENRY DUNNING MACLEOD, M.A. Barrister-at-Law. Second Edition. entirely remodelled. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.

M'Culloch's Dictionary, Practical, Theoretical, and Historical, of Commerce and Commercial Navigation. New Edition, revised throughout and corrected to the Present Time; with a Biographical Notice of the Author. Edited by H. G. REID, Secretary to Mr. M'Culloch for many years. 8vo. price 63s. cloth.

Modern Cookery for Private Families, reduced to a System of Easy Practice in a Series of carefully-tested Receipts. By ELIZA ACTON. Newly revised and enlarged; with 8 Plates, Figures, and 150 Woodcuts. Fep. 6s.

A Practical Treatise on Brewing; with Formulæ for Public Brewers, and Instructions for Private Families. By W. BLACK. Fifth Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Cabinet Lawyer; a Popular Digest of the Laws of England, Civil, Criminal, and Constitutional. Twenty-third Edition, corrected and brought up to the Present Date. Fep. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

Maunder's Treasury of Knowledge and Library of Reference: comprising an English Dictionary and Grammar, Universal Gazetteer, Classical Dictionary, Chronology, Law Dictionary, Synopsis of the Peerage, Useful Tables, &c. Fep. 6s.

Chess Openings. By F. W. LONGMAN, Balliol College, Oxford. Fep. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Hints to Mothers on the Management of their Health during the Period of Pregnancy and in the Lying-in Room. By THOMAS BULL, M.D. Fep. 5s.

The Maternal Management of Children in Health and Disease. By THOMAS BULL, M.D. Fep. 5s.

How to Nurse Sick Children; containing Directions which may be found of service to all who have charge of the Young. By CHARLES WEST, M.D. Second Edition. Fep. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Notes on Lying-In Institutions; with a Proposal for Organising an Institution for Training Midwives and Midwifery Nurses. By FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE. With several Illustrations. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

Notes on Hospitals. By FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE. Third Edition, enlarged; with 13 Plans. Post 4to. 18s.

Tidd Pratt's Law relating to Benefit Building Societies; with Practical Observations on the Act and all the Cases decided thereon, also a Form of Rules and Forms of Mortgages. Fep. 3s. 6d.

Collieries and Colliers: a Handbook of the Law and Leading Cases relating thereto. By J. C. FOWLER, Barrister. Second Edition. Fep. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Coulthart's Decimal Interest Tables at Twenty-four Different Rates not exceeding Five per Cent. Calculated for the use of Bankers. To which are added Commission Tables at One-eighth and One-fourth per Cent. 8vo. 15s.

Willich's Popular Tables for Ascertaining the Value of Lifehold, Leasehold, and Church Property, Renewal Fines, &c.; the Public Funds; Annual Average Price and Interest on Consols from 1731 to 1867; Chemical, Geographical, Astronomical, Trigonometrical Tables, &c. Post 8vo. 10s.

Pewtner's Comprehensive Specifier; a Guide to the Practical Specification of every kind of Building-Artificer's Work: with Forms of Building Conditions and Agreements, an Appendix, Foot-Notes, and Index. Edited by W. YOUNG. Architect. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Periodical Publications.

The Edinburgh Review, or Critical Journal, published Quarterly in January, April, July, and October. 8vo. price 6s. each Number.

Fraser's Magazine. Edited by JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. New Series published on the 1st of each Month. 8vo. price 2s. 6d. each Number.

Notes on Books: An Analysis of the Works published during each Quarter by Messrs. LONGMANS & Co. The object is to enable Bookbuyers to obtain such information regarding the various works as is usually afforded by tables of contents and explanatory prefaces. 4to. Quarterly. *Gratis*.

The Alpine Journal; A Record of Mountain Adventure and Scientific Observation. By Members of the Alpine Club. Edited by LESLIE STEPHEN. Published Quarterly, May 31, Aug. 31, Nov. 30, Feb. 28. 8vo. price 1s. 6d. each Number.

Knowledge for the Young.

The Stepping Stone to Knowledge: Containing upwards of Seven Hundred Questions and Answers on Miscellaneous Subjects, adapted to the capacity of Infant Minds. By a MOTHER. New Edition, enlarged and improved. 18mo. price 1s.

Second Series of the Stepping Stone to Knowledge: containing upwards of Eight Hundred Questions and Answers on Miscellaneous Subjects not contained in the FIRST SERIES. 18mo. 1s.

The Stepping Stone to Geography: Containing several Hundred Questions and Answers on Geographical Subjects. 18mo. 1s.

The Stepping Stone to French Pronunciation and Conversation: Containing several Hundred Questions and Answers. By Mr. P. SADLER. 18mo. 1s.

The Stepping Stone to English History: Containing several Hundred Questions and Answers on the History of England. 1s.

The Stepping Stone to English Grammar: Containing several Hundred Questions and Answers on English Grammar. By Mr. P. SADLER. 18mo. 1s.

The Stepping Stone to Bible Knowledge: Containing several Hundred Questions and Answers on the Old and New Testaments. 18mo. 1s.

The Stepping Stone to Biography: Containing several Hundred Questions and Answers on the Lives of Eminent Men and Women. 18mo. 1s.

The Stepping Stone to Natural History: VERTEBRATE OR BACKBONED ANIMALS. PART I. *Mammalia*; PART II. *Birds, Reptiles, Fishes*. 18mo. 1s. each Part.

INDEX.

ACTON's Modern Cookery.....	19	Cabinet Lawyer.....	19
ALCOCK's Residence in Japan.....	16	CAMPBELL's Norway.....	15
ALLIES on Formation of Christendom.....	14	CARNOTA's Memoirs of Pombal.....	3
ALLEN's Discourses of Chrysostom.....	14	CATES's Biographical Dictionary.....	4
Alpine Guide (The).....	16	CATS and FARLIE's Moral Emblems.....	11
— Journal.....	20	Changed Aspects of Unchanged Truths....	6
ALTHAUS on Medical Electricity.....	10	CHESNEY's Indian Polity.....	2
ARNOLD's Manual of English Literature..	5	— Waterloo Campaign.....	2
ARNOTT's Elements of Physics.....	8	CHESNEY's and REEVE's Military Essays..	2
Arundines Cami.....	18	Chorale Book for England.....	11
Autumn Holidays of a Country Parson....	6	CLOUGH's Lives from Plutarch.....	2
AYRE's Treasury of Bible Knowledge.....	14	COLENSO (Bishop) on Pentateuch and Book of Joshua.....	14
BACON's Essays by WHATELY.....	5	Commonplace Philosopher in Town and Country.....	3
— Life and Letters, by SPEDDING..	4	CONINGTON's Translation of Virgil's <i>Æneid</i> ..	18
— Works.....	5	CONTANSEAU's Two French Dictionaries..	6
BAIN's Mental and Moral Science.....	7	CONYBEARE and HOWSON's Life and Epistles of St. Paul.....	14
— on the Senses and Intellect.....	7	COOPER's Surgical Dictionary.....	10
BALL's Guide to the Central Alps.....	16	COPLAND's Dictionary of Practical Medicine	11
— Guide to the Western Alps.....	16	COULTHART's Decimal Interest Tables....	19
— Guide to the Eastern Alps.....	16	Counsel and Comfort from a City Pulpit..	6
BAYLDON's Rents and Tillages.....	13	COX's (G. W.) Aryan Mythology.....	3
Beaten Tracks.....	16	— Tale of the Great Persian War..	2
BECKER's <i>Charicles</i> and <i>Gallus</i>	17	— Tales of Ancient Greece.....	17
BENFEY's Sanskrit-English Dictionary....	6	CRESY's Encyclopædia of Civil Engineering	12
BERNARD on British Neutrality.....	1	Critical Essays of a Country Parson.....	6
BLACK's Treatise on Brewing.....	19	CROOKES on Beet-Root Sugar.....	13
BLACKLEY's German-English Dictionary..	6	— Chemical Analysis.....	9
BLAINE's Rural Sports.....	18	CULLEY's Handbook of Telegraphy.....	12
— Veterinary Art.....	18	CUSACK's Student's History of Ireland....	2
BOOTH's Saint-Simon.....	3	D'AUBIGNÉ's History of the Reformation in the time of CALVIN.....	2
BOULTBEE on 39 Articles.....	13	DAVIDSON's Introduction to New Testament	14
BOURNE on Screw Propeller.....	12	Dead Shot (The), by MARKSMAN.....	18
— Catechism of the Steam Engine..	12	DE LA RIVE's Treatise on Electricity.....	8
— Examples of Modern Engines....	12	DENISON's Vice-Regal Life.....	1
— Handbook of Steam Engine.....	12	DE TOCQUEVILLE's Democracy in America..	2
— Treatise on the Steam Engine....	12	DISRAELI's Lothair.....	16
— Improvements in the same.....	12	— Novels and Tales.....	16
BOWDLER's Family SHAKSPEARE.....	18	DOBSON on the Ox.....	19
BOYD's Reminiscences.....	3	DOVE's Law of Storms.....	8
BRAMLEY-MOORE's Six Sisters of the Valley	17	DOYLE's Fairyland.....	11
BRANDE's Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art.....	9	DYER's City of Rome.....	2
BRAY's (C.) Education of the Feelings... 7		EASTLAKE's Gothic Revival.....	12
— Philosophy of Necessity.....	7	— Hints on Household Taste.....	12
— On Force.....	7	— History of Oil Painting.....	11
BROWNE's Exposition of the 39 Articles... 13		— Life of Gibson.....	11
BRUNEL's Life of BRUNEL.....	3	Edinburgh Review.....	20
BUCKLE's History of Civilisation.....	1	Elements of Botany.....	9
BULL's Hints to Mothers.....	19		
— Maternal Management of Children..	19		
BUNSEN's God in History.....	3		
— Prayers.....	13		
BURKE's Vicissitudes of Families.....	4		
BURTON's Christian Church.....	3		

ELLICOTT on the Revision of the English New Testament	13	HOWITT's Australian Discovery.....	16
—————'s Commentary on Ephesians	14	————— Mad War Planet.....	18
————— Lectures on Life of Christ	14	————— Northern Heights of London....	16
————— Commentary on Galatians	14	————— Rural Life of England	16
————— Pastoral Epist.	14	————— Visits to Remarkable Places	16
————— Philippians, &c.	14	HÜBNER's Pope Sixtus	4
————— Thessalonians	14	HUGHES's Manual of Geography	8
EWALD's History of Israel	14	HUME's Essays	7
		————— Treatise on Human Nature.....	7
FAIRBAIRN's Application of Cast and Wrought Iron to Building	12	IHNE's History of Rome	19
————— Information for Engineers	12	INGELOW's Poems	18
————— Treatise on Mills and Millwork ..	12	————— Story of Doom	18
————— Iron Shipbuilding	12	————— Mopsa	18
FARADAY's Life and Letters	4	JAMESON's Legends of Saints and Martyrs..	11
FARRAR's Chapters on Language	5	————— Legends of the Madonna	11
————— Families of Speech	7	————— Legends of the Monastic Orders ..	11
FELKIN on Hosiery & Lace Manufactures..	13	————— Legends of the Saviour.....	11
FENNEL's Book of the Roach	18	JOHN JERNINGHAM's Journal	18
FFOULKE's Christendom's Divisions	15	JOHNSTON's Geographical Dictionary	7
FITZWYGRAM on Horses and Stables	18		
FOWLER's Collieries and Colliers	19	KALISCH's Commentary on the Bible.....	5
FRANCIS's Fishing Book	18	————— Hebrew Grammar.....	5
FRASER's Magazine.....	20	KEITH on Destiny of the World.....	14
FRESHFIELD's Travels in the Caucasus ...	15	————— Fulfilment of Prophecy.....	14
FROUDE's History of England	1	KERL's Metallurgy, by CROOKES and RÖHRIG	13
————— Short Studies	6	KIRBY and SPENCE's Entomology.....	9
GANOT's Elementary Physics	8		
GIANT (The)	17	LATHAM's English Dictionary.....	5
GILBERT's Cadore	15	LAWLOR's Pilgrimages in the Pyrenees ...	16
————— and CHURCHILL's Dolomites ...	16	LECKY's History of European Morals	3
GIRDLESTONE's Bible Synonyms	13	————— Rationalism.....	3
GIRVIN's House I Live In	10	Leisure Hours in Town.....	6
GLEDSTONE's Life of WHITEFIELD	3	Lessons of Middle Age	6
GODDARD's Wonderful Stories	17	LEWES's Biographical History of Philosophy	3
GOLDSMITH's Poems, Illustrated	17	LIDDELL and SCOTT's Greek-English Lexicon	6
GRAHAM's View of Literature and Art ...	2	————— Abridged ditto	6
GRANT's Ethics of Aristotle.....	5	Life of Man Symbolised.....	11
————— Home Politics.....	2	LINDLEY and MOORE's Treasury of Botany	9
Graver Thoughts of a Country Parson....	6	LONGMAN's Edward the Third	1
Gray's Anatomy.....	10	————— Lectures on History of England	1
GREENHOW on Bronchitis	10	————— Chess Openings.....	19
GRIFFITH's Fundamentals	13	LOUDON's Encyclopædia of Agriculture ...	13
GROVE on Correlation of Physical Forces ..	9	————— Gardening	13
GURNEY's Chapters of French History ...	2	————— Plants	9
GWILTY's Encyclopædia of Architecture ...	12	LOWNDES's Engineer's Handbook.....	12
		LUBBOCK's Origin of Civilisation	9
HAMPDEN's (Bishop) Memorials	3	Lyra Eucharistica	15
Hare on Election of Representatives	5	————— Germanica	11, 15
HARTWIG's Harmonies of Nature.....	9	————— Messianica	15
————— Polar World	9	————— Mystica	15
————— Sea and its Living Wonders....	9		
————— Subterranean World	9	MACAULAY's (Lord) Essays	3
————— Tropical World.....	9	————— History of England ..	1
HAUGHTON's Manual of Geology	8	————— Lays of Ancient Rome ..	17
HERSCHEL's Outlines of Astronomy	7	————— Miscellaneous Writings ..	6
HEWITT on the Diseases of Women	10	————— Speeches	5
HODGSON's Time and Space.....	7	————— Works	1
————— Theory of Practice	7	MACFARREN's Lectures on Harmony	11
HOLMES's Surgical Treatment of Children..	10	MACLEOD's Elements of Political Economy	4
————— System of Surgery	10	————— Dictionary of Political Economy	4
Home (The) at Heatherbrae	17	————— Theory and Practice of Banking	19
HORNE's Introduction to the Scriptures ..	14	McCULLOCH's Dictionary of Commerce	19
————— Compendium of the Scriptures ..	14		
How we Spent the Summer.....	16		

MAGUIRE's Life of Father Mathew	4	NIGHTINGALE's Notes on Hospitals	19
————— PIUS IX.....	14	————— Lying-In Institutions	19
MALET's Overthrow of the Germanic Confederation	2	NILSSON's Scandinavia	9
MANNING's England and Christendom	15	NORTHCOTT on Lathes and Turning	12
MARCEY on the Larynx	10	Notes on Books.....	20
MARSHALL's Canadian Dominion.....	7	ODDLING's Animal Chemistry	10
————— Physiology	11	————— Course of Practical Chemistry ..	9
MARSHMAN's History of India	2	————— Manual of Chemistry.....	9
————— Life of Havelock	4	————— Lectures on Carbon	10
MARTINEAU's Endeavours after the Christian Life	15	————— Outlines of Chemistry	10
MASSINGBERD's History of the Reformation	3	O'DRISCOLL's Memoir of Maclise	3
MAUNDER's Biographical Treasury	4	O'FLANAGAN's Irish Chancellors	4
————— Geographical Treasury	8	Our Children's Story	16
————— Historical Treasury	3	OWEN's Comparative Anatomy and Physiology of Vertebrate Animals	8
————— Scientific and Literary Treasury	9	————— Lectures on the Invertebrata.....	8
————— Treasury of Knowledge.....	19		
————— Treasury of Natural History ..	9		
MAY's Constitutional History of England..	1		
MELVILLE's Digby Grand.....	17	PACKE's Guide to the Pyrenees.....	16
————— General Bounce	17	PAGET's Lectures on Surgical Pathology ..	10
————— Gladiators	17	PEREIRA's Manual of Materia Medica.....	11
————— Good for Nothing	17	PERKINS's Italian and Tuscan Sculptors ..	11
————— Holmby House.....	17	PERRING's Churches and Creeds	13
————— Interpreter	17	PEWTERER's Comprehensive Specifier	20
————— Kate Coventry.....	17	————— Pictures in Tyrol	16
————— Queen's Maries	17	PIESSE's Art of Perfumery	13
MENDELSSOHN's Letters	4	————— Chemical, Natural, and Physical Magic	13
MERIVALE's Fall of the Roman Republic ..	2	PONTON's Beginning	8
————— Romans under the Empire	2	PRATT's Law of Building Societies	19
MERRIFIELD and EVERS's Navigation	7	PRENDERGAST's Mastery of Languages	6
MILES on Horse's Foot and Horse Shoeing .	19	PRESCOTT's Scripture Difficulties.....	14
————— on Horses' Teeth and Stables	19	Present-Day Thoughts, by A. K. H. B.	6
MILL (J.) on the Mind	4	PROCTOR's Plurality of Worlds	7
MILL (J. S.) on Liberty.....	4	————— Saturn	7
————— Subjection of Women	4	————— Scientific Essays	8
————— on Representative Government	4	————— Sun.....	7
————— on Utilitarianism	4	Public Schools Atlas	8
—————'s Dissertations and Discussions.....	4		
————— Political Economy	4	RAE's Westward by Rail	15
————— System of Logic.....	5	Recreations of a Country Parson	6
————— Hamilton's Philosophy	4	REICHEL's See of Rome.....	14
————— Inaugural Address at St. Andrew's.	4	REILLY's Map of Mont Blanc.....	16
MILLER's Elements of Chemistry	9	REIMANN on Aniline Dyes	13
————— Hymn Writers	15	RIVERS's Rose Amateur's Guide	9
MITCHELL's Manual of Architecture	12	ROBBINS's Cavalry Catechism	19
————— Manual of Assaying	13	ROGERS's Correspondence of Greyson	6
MONSELL's Beatitudes	15	————— Eclipse of Faith	6
————— His Presence not his Memory..	15	————— Defence of Faith	6
————— 'Spiritual Songs'	15	ROGET's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases	5
MOORE's Irish Melodies	17	RONALDS's Fly-Fisher's Entomology	13
————— Lalla Rookh	17	ROSE's Loyola	14
————— Poetical Works.....	17	ROTHSCHILD's Israelites	14
MORELL's Elements of Psychology	7	ROWTON's Debater	5
MORELL's Mental Philosophy	7	RUSSELL's Pau and the Pyrenees.....	15
MÜLLER's (Max) Chips from a German Workshop	7		
————— Lectures on the Science of Language.....	5	SANDARS's Justinian's Institutes	5
————— (K. O.) Literature of Ancient Greece	2	SAVILLE on Truth of the Bible.....	13
MURCHISON on Liver Complaints	10	SCOTT's Lectures on the Fine Arts	11
MURE's Language and Literature of Greece	2	————— Albert Durer.....	11
		SEEBOHM's Oxford Reformers of 1498	2
NASH's Compendium of the Prayer-Book ..	13	SEWELL's After Life	17
New Testament Illustrated with Wood Engravings from the Old Masters	11	————— Glimpse of the World	17
NEWMAN's History of his Religious Opinions	4	————— History of the Early Church	3
		————— Journal of a Home Life	17

SEWELL'S Passing Thoughts on Religion ..	15	TYNDALL'S Lectures on Light	
— Poems of Bygone Years	18	— Lectures on Sound	
— Preparation for Communion	15	— Heat a Mode of Motion	
— Principles of Education	15		
— Readings for Confirmation	15	UEBERWEG'S System of Logic	
— Readings for Lent	15	Uncle PETER'S Fairy Tale	18
— Examination for Confirmation ..	15	URE'S Dictionary of Arts, Manufactures, and	
— Stories and Tales	16 & 17	Mines	12
— Thoughts for the Age	15		
— Thoughts for the Holy Week	15	VAN DER HOEVEN'S Handbook of Zoology..	
SHIPLEY'S Four Cardinal Virtues	14	VEREKER'S Sunny South	13
— Invocation of Saints	15	Visit to my Discontented Cousin	16
SHORT'S Church History	3		
Smart's WALKER'S English Dictionaries ..	5	WARBURTON'S Hunting Songs	18
SMITH'S (V.) Bible and Popular Theology..	13	WATSON'S Principles and Practice of Physic	10
— Paul's Voyage and Shipwreck	13	WATT'S Dictionary of Chemistry	9
— (SIDNEY) Life and Letters	3	WEBB'S Objects for Common Telescopes...	7
— Miscellaneous Works ..	6	WEBSTER & WILKINSON'S Greek Testament	14
— Wit and Wisdom	6	WELLINGTON'S Life, by GLEIG	4
SOUTHEY'S Doctor	5	WEST on Children's Diseases	10
— Poetical Works	17	— on Children's Nervous Disorders ...	10
STANLEY'S History of British Birds	9	— on Nursing Sick Children	19
STATHAM'S Eucharis	18	WHATELY'S English Synonyms	5
STEBBING'S Analysis of MILL'S Logic	5	— Logic	5
STEPHEN'S Ecclesiastical Biography	4	— Rhetoric	5
— Playground of Europe	15	WHITE and RIDDLE'S Latin Dictionaries ..	7
Stepping-Stone to Knowledge, &c.	20	WILCOCK'S Sea Fisherman	13
STIRLING'S Secret of Hegel	7	WILLIAMS'S Aristotle's Ethics	5
— Sir WILLIAM HAMILTON	7	WILLIAMS on Climate of South of France..	10
STONEHENGE on the Dog	19	— Consumption	10
— on the Greyhound	19	WILLICH'S Popular Tables	20
STRICKLAND'S Queens of England	4	WILLIS'S Principles of Mechanism	12
Sunday Afternoons at the Parish Church of		WINSLOW on Light	8
a Scottish University City	6	WOOD'S (J. G.) Bible Animals	9
		— Homes without Hands	9
TAYLOR'S History of India	2	— Insects at Home	8
— (Jeremy) Works, edited by EDEN ..	15	— Strange Dwellings	8
THIRLWALL'S History of Greece	2	— (T.) Chemical Notes	16
THOMSON'S Conspectus	11	WOODWARD and CATES'S Encyclopædia ..	2
— Laws of Thought	5		
TODD (A.) on Parliamentary Government ..	1	YARDLEY'S Poetical Works	18
— and BOWMAN'S Anatomy and Phy-		YONGE'S History of England	1
siology of Man	10	— English-Greek Lexicons	
TRENCH'S <i>Ierne</i>	17	— Two Editions of <i>Iherace</i>	18
— Realities of Irish Life	2	YOUATT on the Dog	15
TROLLOPE'S Barchester Towers	17	— on the Horse	
— Warden	17		
TWISS'S Law of Nations	19	ZELLER'S Socrates	
TYNDALL'S Diamagnetism	8	— Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics..	
— Faraday as a Discoverer	4	Zigzagging amongst Dolomites	
— Fragments of Science	8		
— Hours of Exercise in the Alps..	15		
— Lectures on Electricity	8		



